5-2004

A Study of the Perceptions of Job Satisfaction of General and Special Education Teachers in Selected Georgia Elementary Schools Implementing the Inclusion Model

Jonathan Edward Willard
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jonathan Edward Willard entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Job Satisfaction of General and Special Education Teachers in Selected Georgia Elementary Schools Implementing the Inclusion Model." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Teacher Education.

Thomas W. George, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Mary Jane Connelly, Ted Miller, Lloyd Davis, Kathy Puckett

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jonathan Edward Willard entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Job Satisfaction of General and Special Education Teachers in Selected Georgia Elementary Schools Implementing the Inclusion Model." I have examined the final paper copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Teacher Education.

Thomas W. George, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Mary Jane Connelly

Lloyd Dale Davis

Ted Nunn

Kathleen Puckett

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost and Dean
Graduate Studies

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION OF GENERAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN SELECTED GEORGIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTING THE INCLUSION MODEL

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jonathan Edward Willard

May 2004

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my mother, Sue Willard, who has always offered encouragement and support, to my wife, Jabrina, who has encouraged me in times of doubt, and to my daughter, Gracie, who continually amazes me with her curiosity and sense of wonder.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee, especially Dr. Tom George, Chair, for the support and assistance needed to complete this work. The insight provided by Mary Jane Connelly, Lloyd Davis, Ted Miller, and Kathy Puckett was instrumental in the preparation of this dissertation.

Teaching has been a very rewarding experience for me, but I never would have thought of being a teacher without the influence of key individuals as named below.

To my brother in law, Bob Walter, for his unfailing example of educational leadership, commitment to excellence in education, and nurturing personality that made me realize that education was more than just content delivery. Without his influence, I would never have considered being a teacher.

To my dear friend Bill Butterfield, for his friendship, guidance, and wisdom that gave me a new perspective about the world of education and life in general.

To my dear friends Deedee Raulston and Janet Tate, who took me under their wings, taught me how to teach, and then pushed me out of the nest when I was ready to go.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of job satisfaction of general and special education teachers. Full-time teachers in grades K-5 in 26 randomly selected Georgia elementary schools were surveyed. Differences in job satisfaction were measured through the use of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form (MSQ) and a descriptive survey accompanying it. Differences in responses based on the descriptors were analyzed using the Mann Whitney *U* and multivariate analysis of variance at a confidence level of .05.

General education teachers reported greater levels of satisfaction than special education teachers on the MSQ scales of Achievement, Social Status, and Variety. These scales are all intrinsic in nature.

No statistically significant differences (.05, two-tailed) were found between general and special education teachers' mean responses on the MSQ intrinsic, extrinsic, or general satisfaction scales.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background of the Problem

With the advent of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 and Public Law 94-142 of 1975, school systems are under federal mandate to include students with disabilities in the general classroom to the greatest extent possible in the least restrictive environment. The concept of students with disabilities being in the general classroom certainly has major implications for the delivery of special education services as well as the impact of these students upon the dynamics of the general education classroom. This becomes especially true as many systems are adopting the inclusion model with general and special education teachers collaborating and co-teaching within the confines of one classroom.

While inclusion has been demonstrated to show positive effects in both learning and socialization skills for students with disabilities (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995; Giangreco, Baumgart, & Doyle, 1995; Madden & Slavin, 1983; Phillips, Sapona, & Lubic, 1995; Sharpe, York, & Knight, 1994; Snow, 1991; Staub & Peck, 1995), this model, in many cases, has been thrust upon general and special education teachers with little consideration given to planning for co-teaching and collaboration. As a result, teachers are thrust into positions as partners in an educational process, a process in which most teachers are unaccustomed. General education teachers are challenged by having students with learning difficulties in their classroom and are now also faced with

sharing their once private teaching space with another individual under the assumption that they will be equals in all aspects of the teaching process. This task becomes even more daunting when the general education teacher has had very little or no training in working with students with disabilities much less collaborating with another teacher in such a direct manner.

For the special education teacher, the new responsibilities under the inclusion model are equally complex. Traditionally, special educators are trained in diagnostic and prescriptive teaching in which they work to remediate specific learning difficulties faced by the individual. In most universities, special education courses are not geared toward content area knowledge, nor are they geared toward classroom management techniques outside the realm of behavior modification models. Special education teachers have traditionally worked in small group or individual settings and not in a class of 30 or more students. Further, in the inclusion model, special education teachers become responsible for planning and collaborating with other teachers for daily lessons and do not have the luxury of their very own classroom in which to feel the much needed sanctity of their "own space." Finally, despite the idea of collaborating and co-teaching, the paperwork issues surrounding the maintenance and development of individual education plans continue to be a major aspect of the special educator's job.

Clearly inclusion with co-teaching provides challenges for both general and special education teachers. As the attrition rate of special educators continues to increase in school systems across the country, it becomes increasingly important to look at issues of job satisfaction and how the inclusion model affects overall job satisfaction. Inclusion is also important with regard to job satisfaction for the general education teacher.

Working collaboratively with others and having students with special needs in the classroom calls for skills and training often overlooked at the preservice level. In this light, it becomes important for school administrators to examine the need for such training.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction of elementary level general and special educators implementing the inclusion model as compared to elementary level general and special education teachers who use more traditional models of special education service delivery such as resource or pull-out models of instruction.

Research Question Null Hypotheses

1. There is no difference in the responses of elementary level general and special education teachers on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ).

2. Based on teacher classification, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method, there is no difference for the following MSQ subscales:

    a. Intrinsic Satisfaction
    b. Extrinsic Satisfaction
    c. General Satisfaction

Significance of the Study

This study will provide insight into the perceptions of satisfaction of both general and special education teachers working in the inclusion model. Administrators in both direct and indirect supervisory roles can use this information to examine policy and implement changes in order to increase teacher satisfaction and, thus, retain teachers. The results of this study should also be useful to administrators of other programs involving

collaborative teaching strategies and multi-level class placements. Furthermore, the results of this study should be of interest to teacher educators who work with general and special education students at the preservice level.

Limitations and Delimitations

The limitations of this study include the following:

1) The study is limited to those teachers who returned the questionnaire with valid responses.

2) The study is limited to the perceptions and honesty of the participants in completing the questionnaire.

3) The study is limited to those schools whose administrators granted permission for the teachers to be surveyed.

The delimitations of this study include the following:

1) The sample size of this study is delimited to elementary schools participating in the Georgia Department of Education program known as Project WINning Team and demographically matched schools.

2) The study is delimited to a random sample of schools participating in the Georgia Department of Education's Project WINning Team and their demographically matched schools.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions will be taken under consideration in compiling the data for this study:

1) It is assumed that professional general and special educators will be willing to contribute data to this study.

2) It is assumed the individuals above are fully qualified to provide the data concerning the functions of general and special educators.

3) It is assumed that the items in the questionnaire accurately measure the factors being considered.

4) It is assumed the participants responded honestly.

5) It is assumed the schools are representative of the designated population.

Definition of Terms

Teachers are those individuals who work full time in an instructional classroom in an educational setting.

General Education Teachers are those individuals who work primarily with students without disabilities as defined by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997.

Special Education Teachers are those individuals who are trained to work primarily with students with disabilities in an inclusive or self-contained classroom.

Inclusion is the practice of including students with disabilities to the greatest extent possible with their non-disabled peers in the least restrictive environment possible. In this sense, this definition is in line with what some individuals term as partial inclusion. This model allows students to be pulled out of the general classroom for resource classes if the IEP committee determines it is the most appropriate placement.

Resource/Pull-Out Model is the method of special education service delivery in which a special education teacher serves students with disabilities outside the general classroom. In this model, there is no co-teaching or collaboration between special and general education teachers other than consultation.

Elementary education teachers are those who teach in kindergarten through fifth grade.

Administrators are principals, supervisors, or administrative officials of the school or school system.

Job Satisfaction is the condition of contentment or of having a positive attitude toward one's work or working conditions.

Job Dissatisfaction is the individual's negative attitude toward employment.

Co-teaching is an instructional approach in which two or more teachers or other certified staff share instruction for a single group of students within a classroom setting.

Consultation is the practice of general meetings between a general education teacher and a special education teacher to discuss and monitor progress of students with disabilities who are not being directly taught by a special education teacher.

Project WINning Team is a program run by the Georgia Department of Education in collaboration with universities and colleges to improve collaborative teaching at the K-5 level. When implemented, the program will effectively reduce pupil/teacher ratio,

improve individual student performance and attendance, reduce retention and referrals to special education, reduce the number of students eligible for categorical programs, and comply with the mandates of IDEA regarding access to the general curriculum and least restrictive environment (Additional information in Appendix A).

Extrinsic satisfaction factors are those that come from sources outside the individual or are those that may be applied to the individual from another source.

Intrinsic satisfaction factors are those that come from sources inside the individual and are self-applied.

General satisfaction factors are those attitudes by the individual toward co-workers and working conditions.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter One, the introduction to the study, includes the following: background of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, assumptions, and definitions. Chapter Two is a review of literature related to the study. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the study and includes information regarding the subjects, procedures, instrumentation, and statistical analysis. Chapter Four presents the data analysis and results of the study. Chapter Five discusses the findings of the study, presents the conclusions and summary, and gives recommendations for replication of the study and for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This section provides a review of selected job satisfaction literature. It is divided into six major sections: 1) A Historical Overview of Job Satisfaction; 2) Definition of Job Satisfaction; 3) Theories of Job Satisfaction; 4) Indicators of Job Satisfaction; 5) Issues Specifically Related to Special Education; and 6) the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

A Historical Overview of Job Satisfaction

The majority of studies on job satisfaction have come from workplace research by industrial psychologists. Locke (1976) categorized three trends in the examination of satisfaction in the workplace. Beginning in the 1920's, the working conditions and the physical arrangement of an individual's work environment were studied. The effect of pay upon job satisfaction was also investigated. In the 1930's, the effect of human relations upon job satisfaction was examined with the focus being placed upon the social role of the work group and the effect of supervision upon the worker. The 1950's and 1960's brought about the investigation of the nature of an individual's work and the factors that produced job satisfaction. Spector (1997) indicated that the current research trend in job satisfaction is focused upon the cognitive processes of the workers.

The study of job satisfaction has its roots in the industrial sector due to the importance of improving worker productivity. One of the first studies to examine the relationship of the physical environment and worker productivity was carried out at the

Bethlehem Steelworks in 1911 by Frederick Taylor (1911). In the late 1920's, another important study was conducted at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago. Initially this study was designed to investigate the relationship between working conditions and physical conditions at the plant. However, the study demonstrated that social factors and worker expectations had the greatest impact on job satisfaction.

The Hawthorne Studies opened the door to the investigation of the many factors that impact job satisfaction. Hoppock (1935) discussed that it may not be possible to disassociate job satisfaction with other satisfactions in life. He states, "family relationships, health, relative social status in the community, and a multitude of other factors may be just as important as the job itself in determining what we tentatively call satisfaction" (p. 5). Hoppock's speculations are supported in other studies. Brayfield, Wells, and Strate (1957) noted that a study of University of Minnesota alumni found that attitudes toward work significantly and positively related to life in general. In a study of 911 heads of household, Bamundo and Kopelman (1980) found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Despite the breadth of research focusing on the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction, many researchers believe the studies linking the two are too simplistic. Rain, Lane, and Steiner (1991) analyzed four literature reviews done in the 1980's on the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Their findings indicated that a "spillover hypothesis" was more prevalent in the studies. They described the "spillover hypothesis" as job satisfaction and life satisfaction each

influencing the other as opposed to a one-sided effect of job satisfaction affecting life satisfaction.

Research has also indicated that intrinsic factors of work, or how people feel about the nature of job tasks, are instrumental in producing feelings of job satisfaction (Bockman, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; O'Driscoll, & Randall, 1999; Thorpe & Campbell, 1965). Among these factors were: acquiring success and recognition, being able to apply or use skills (ability utilization), and feeling worthwhile and involved in the job (Gruneberg, 1979). Valentine, Valentine, and Dick (1998) found that intrinsic factors such as high involvement and enhanced self esteem were a significant predictor of job attitudes among older workers. While the influence of intrinsic factors on job satisfaction has been supported, other studies have found that extrinsic factors, which are external to the job, influence job satisfaction (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957; Carraher & Buckley, 1996; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Graham, 1966; Hulin & Smith, 1965; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Lobban, Husted & Farewell, 1998; Martin & Schinke, 1998; Pearson, 1991).

Situational factors, which consist of influences from the nature of the work itself, have been shown to affect job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). One situational factor associated with job satisfaction is the level of the job itself. Typically, higher level jobs are more complex and require greater skill diversity therefore they often have better working conditions and benefits. In a study of 440 hospital employees, Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, and Smith (1998) found a consistently positive relationship between the measures of job level and job satisfaction.

More recently, the hypothesis of dispositional factors has been proposed to explain job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Steel & Rentsch, 1997). This approach is based on the notion that a person's character traits influence feelings about job satisfaction apart from the job or the environment. Judge et al. (1997) indicated that value judgments or "core evaluations" represented the way individuals perceive themselves, other people, and the world. In a study of self core evaluations, which included self esteem, self efficacy, locus of control, and non-neuroticism, Judge et al. found that core evaluations of the self had consistent effects on job satisfaction that were independent of the job attributes. They concluded that people with positive self core evaluations view their lives and jobs in a better light because their internal make-up allows them to do so (Judge et al., 1998).

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction can be defined in a number of ways. Porter (1961) described satisfaction as the difference between what a person thought he should receive and what was actually received. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) defined job satisfaction as "the favorable viewpoint of the worker toward the role he presently occupies" (p. 172). Job satisfaction has been described as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of one's job or experiences" (Locke, 1976). Legge and Mumford (1978) described satisfaction as a positive orientation of a person toward a specific work role. Spector (1997) stated that "Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs" (p. 2). Nine different operational definitions of job satisfaction were identified by Wanous and Lawler (1972), with each described in terms of how different aspects or facets of job satisfaction are measured and how they combine

to achieve an overall measure of satisfaction. These definitions included: 1) overall job satisfaction as the sum of job facet satisfaction across all facets of a job; 2) job satisfaction as a weighted sum of job facet satisfaction; 3) job satisfaction as the sum of goal attainment of need fulfillment when summed across job facets; 4) job satisfaction as a correspondence to Vroom's "valence for a job" (valence is the positive or negative value that a person assigns to the possible outcomes of an action at work); 5) job satisfaction as a discrepancy between how much there is now and how much there should be; 6) job satisfaction as a result of comparison between fulfillment and desires or ideals in the present; 7) job satisfaction as a measure of desires or ideals of what one would like; 8) job satisfaction as the importance of a job facet that determines the degree of affect produced by an amount of discrepancy between fulfillment and desires; and 9) job satisfaction as the discrepancy between the importance of a job facet and the perception of fulfillment from a facet.

Job satisfaction has become difficult to define as a result of the many different terms used to describe it. The literature demonstrates that job satisfaction has often been used interchangeably with terms such as morale, attitude, and feelings. Similarly, job satisfaction is difficult to define as a result of how it is measured. Ewen (1967) noted that usually job satisfaction is measured by determining how satisfied employees are with various aspects of their jobs. One concern raised by Ewen is how much weight each job aspect should be weighted in measuring it. Evans (1969) noted that the validity of job satisfaction measures is dependent upon the assumption that assigns equal importance to each aspect. Wanous and Lawler (1972) raised concern that the many conceptual definitions of job satisfaction has led to different ways of measuring the term

"satisfaction." Scarpello and Campbell (1983) observed that while the measurement of overall job satisfaction was the total of job facet satisfaction, this assumption was appropriate only as long as the content of the satisfaction measure is valid.

As there was not clear consensus on how to define or measure job satisfaction, it is considered to be an affective state (Jayaratne, 1993). Spector (1997) stated that "Job satisfaction can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job" (p. 2). Although job satisfaction typically is expressed affectively, the cognitive component of workers' satisfaction with their job is being recognized more and more. Brief (1998) stated that job satisfaction is defined as "an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor" (p. 86).

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Many theories have been developed to explain the concept of job satisfaction. Early theories focused on what affected worker's job satisfaction in industrial organizations. More recent theories have focused on workers' dispositional and cognitive traits that affect job satisfaction.

Hierarchy of Needs Theory

One of the oldest theories is Abraham Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs. This model ranks needs from lowest to highest with the premise that an individual moves to the next level once the previous one is fulfilled. The needs progress from basic physiological needs, safety and security needs, social needs, esteem needs, to the need for self-actualization. In applying this theory to job satisfaction, it is presumed that once an

individual's basic needs such as pay and security have been met, higher order needs such as esteem and self-actualization (fulfillment) can be desired.

Two-Factor Theory

The two-factor theory of job satisfaction, developed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) has been used to characterize what leads to worker satisfaction. The factors, which are known as motivator and hygiene factors, that produce job satisfaction are intrinsic and separate from those factors which produce job dissatisfaction. Motivator or intrinsic factors consist of variables such as achievement, recognition, advancement, responsibility, and work itself. These factors correspond to the level of self-actualization in Maslow's hierarchy (1954). Hygiene or extrinsic factors consist of variables such as pay, security, and physical working conditions. These factors correspond to the lower needs of Maslow's hierarchy. Bockman (1971) noted that "motivators fulfill the individual's need for growth and hygiene factors help him to avoid discomfort and unpleasantness" (p. 158). Herzberg's theory presumed that the presence of motivator factors produce job satisfaction, but their absence does not produce significant job dissatisfaction. Similarly, the presence of hygiene factors does not produce feelings of satisfaction, but the absence of them does lead to job dissatisfaction.

Expectancy Theory

Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory stated that situational and personality variables combine to produce worker job satisfaction. The expectancies were based on the worker's presumption that effort will lead to good performance and good performance will lead to rewards. The difference between what workers actually experience and receive as rewards and what workers expect to receive leads to a

discrepancy. The size of the discrepancy is directly related to the level of job dissatisfaction.

Discrepancy Theory

The discrepancy theory of job satisfaction consists of three factors: a) what people want, b) what people feel they should receive, and c) what people expect. Porter, Locke, and Katzell provided theories based on these factors (Lawler, 1973). Katzell (in Lawler, 1973) indicated that satisfaction is a condition which is determined by the difference between actual outcomes and another outcome that is either expected or felt. It is a comparison of what a person actually receives from a job with what he expects to receive. Job satisfaction is the difference between these two factors. As the difference decreases, the satisfaction increases. Failure to receive an equitable reward for the job results in a feeling of job dissatisfaction. In this theory, the more a person wants from an outcome, the less satisfied he/she is with a discrepancy.

Locke (1970) developed a discrepancy theory that differs from Katzell on three points. First, the perceived discrepancy is important as opposed to the actual discrepancy. Second, satisfaction is described as the difference between what a person wants and what is received. Finally, the greater the wants are over what is received, the greater the dissatisfaction. In other words, satisfaction is determined or influenced by what a person wants (Lawler, 1973).

Porter took a slightly different view of the discrepancy theory by describing satisfaction as the difference between what a person perceived the outcomes of a job should be and the actual outcome of the job. Simply put, satisfaction was determined by what a person felt about the perceived outcome (Chung, 1977).

Equity Theory

Equity theory has its roots in theories of motivation. According to this model, satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what a person received from a job in relation to what was put into a job. Gruneberg (1979) states that equity theory is based on the concept of receiving a "just reward" for efforts. Because individuals characteristically compare themselves to others, workers feel dissatisfied if they believe they are getting less than fellow workers. If the rewards and efforts are comparable to that of others, then people feel satisfied. When there is a discrepancy between a person's perception of effort and rewards compared to theirs, employees will put less into their work and be less productive.

Reference Group Theory

Reference group theory combines aspects of equity theory with the importance of understanding the group with whom the individual relates (Gruneberg, 1979). The theory speculates that since individuals compare themselves with others to determine if they are being treated equitably, then knowledge of the reference group will provide understanding of workers' job satisfaction.

Work Adjustment Theory

The Work Adjustment Theory was developed at the University of Minnesota as part of the Work Adjustment Project of the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation in 1967. It proposes that worker adjustment outcomes can be explained by the interaction between an individual's personality and work environment (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Weiss et al. (1967) stated that "work adjustment depends on how well an individual's abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work, and

how well his needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment" (p. v). Weiss et al. (1967) maintained that "satisfaction and satisfactoriness are measurable indicators of work adjustment, and that they can be measured independently of each other" (p. v).

Situational Theory

The situational theory of job satisfaction posits that job satisfaction is determined by two factors which are labeled situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Situational characteristics include those things workers evaluate before taking a job, such as pay, promotion, working conditions, and supervision. Situational occurrences are those things workers do not previously evaluate and include factors that can be positive or negative. Positive factors might be tangible or intangible, while negative factors might include typical inconveniences or irritations associated with the work environment (Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman, 1992). Both situational characteristics and situational occurrences affect job satisfaction and understanding them can facilitate improved worker satisfaction.

Theory of Individual Differences

Motowidlo's (1996) theory of individual differences in job satisfaction is a cognitive approach to understanding the causes of job satisfaction. This theory states that when workers view their jobs favorably, their evaluation is based on retrieving stored memories from all positive and negative events associated with previous work environments.

Indicators of Job Satisfaction

Many variables have been found to relate positively to job satisfaction while others correlated more strongly to job dissatisfaction. Mortimer (1979) observed there is no uniform agreement among investigators about the importance of job attributes and experiences. Murray indicated the variables are interrelated and difficult to determine their influence upon one another and overall job satisfaction. A review of the literature indicates that most studies have focused on individual differences, age, education, intelligence, sex, and occupational level as determinants of job satisfaction (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969).

Age

Of the characteristics cited as influencing job satisfaction, age has been most consistently linked to it (Anderson, Hohensil, & Brown, 1984; Bernal, Snyder, & McDaniel, 1998; Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996; Glenn, Taylor, & Weaver, 1977; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Hoppock, 1960; Lee & Wilbur, 1985, McArthur & Stevens, 1955). Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) described a U-shaped function to represent job satisfaction in the career span. In this model, job satisfaction with younger workers is initially high, drops after a few years, and finally rises as workers age. Using a sample of British workers, Clark, Oswald, and Warr (1996) concluded that for overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with work and pay itself, strong evidence existed to support a U-shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction. In the 1997 report Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation, The

National Center for Education Statistics (1997) found that elementary and secondary teachers under 30 had higher levels of job satisfaction than their older coworkers.

Another view posits that job satisfaction increases as age increases, demonstrating a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction (Bernal, Snyder, & McDaniel, 1998; Hulin & Smith, 1965; Rhodes, 1983; Ronen, 1978). Glenn, Taylor, and Weaver (1977) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and age for both males and females. Results showed that job satisfaction increases with age for both genders. Sweeney (1981) found that teachers in the 45 and older age group were more satisfied than their colleagues in the 25-34 and 35-44 age groups. Those in the 25-34 age group were the least satisfied. Sweeney (1981) attributed this dissatisfaction to what he termed an "unsettled period" in which the individuals were in a transitory role of starting a family and buying first homes. Sweeney indicated that this period made the individual feel the economic insecurities and questions their commitment to staying in the teaching profession. Lee and Wilbur (1985) surveyed 1,707 public employees. Respondents were categorized by three age groups which corresponded to the early, middle, and late stages of the career span. Findings revealed that job satisfaction increased over time for each of the three age categories.

A final view with regard to the relationship between job satisfaction and age held that job satisfaction and age have a linear relationship until a specific period and then a decline is noted (Saleh & Otis, 1964). In a survey of 118 employees, Saleh and Otis (1964) found that job satisfaction increased with age until pre-retirement and then declined. Other studies did not find any significant relationship between age and job satisfaction. Bernal, Snyder, and McDaniel (1998) studied a national sample of 1,095

workers which included eleven major occupational categories which were divided into five age groups. A weak positive linear relationship was found. Bernal et al. (1998) concluded that age alone is not an effective predictor of job satisfaction.

Gender

Gender differences have been recognized as a factor in job satisfaction. Hulin and Smith (1964), in a survey of 295 male and 163 female workers, found that females tended to be less satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts. They concluded that it is not gender that leads to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but rather a combination of things that covary with gender such as pay, job level, or opportunity for advancement. Hulin (1969) studied the effects of community characteristics on the job satisfaction of 470 male and female workers. This study showed there were differences between males and females for the variables related to both job and life satisfaction. Bhella (1982) suggested in a study that female teachers are more satisfied than their male counterparts. The same results were found by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) study. In a study investigating 338 employees with regard to work and related support networks, Maynard (1986) found no significant differences related to gender. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) suggested that it is not gender differences that lead to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but variations in societal treatment such as different compensation scales for males and females.

Salary/Compensation

Studies linking salary and job satisfaction have shown mixed results. Although the effects of salary on job satisfaction are among the most frequently reported indicators of job satisfaction, accurately determining its association is complicated by factors such

as age, occupational level, and education (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969). Early studies by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) reported that salary was not ranked high in importance by employees. Hoppock (1935) also did not find pay to be a significant factor in job satisfaction. Jennings (2001) in a study of job satisfaction in a Mississippi Delta County found that many teachers were unsatisfied with compensation in pay and benefits. A study by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) also found that teachers making less than $25,000 per year had a higher percentage reporting being satisfied than their coworkers who received higher compensation. However, some studies have shown a positive relationship between age and pay satisfaction (Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Rhodes, 1983). Hulin and Smith (1965) stated that "it is not a worker's salary per se that affects his satisfaction, but rather the discrepancy between what he is earning (present salary) and his salary aspirations (desired salary)" (p. 211). Carraher and Buckley (1996) explored satisfaction with pay based on the concept of cognitive complexity, which was defined as the way in which individuals use their characteristics or traits to understand their world. In their study of 1,969 teachers, Carraher and Buckley (1996) concluded that cognitive complexities could account for different ways individuals conceptualize satisfaction with pay. Spector (1997) noted that workers tend to compare themselves to each other and are more concerned with equality in pay policies than in salary differences.

Opportunities for Advancement

Opportunities for advancement have not been found to significantly affect job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) found that advancement was more likely to be a determinant of job dissatisfaction than job satisfaction. In their

national study of school psychologists' job satisfaction, Brown, Hohensil, and Brown (1998) found that workers were dissatisfied with opportunities for advancement. Brown et al. believed that both the lack and type of positions available to school psychologists contribute to the low priority given to advancement as a factor in job satisfaction.

Tenure

Job tenure has been cited as a factor in job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Schuh, 1967). Herzberg et al. (1957) maintained that workers typically have high morale when starting a job but then those workers' morale drops during the first few years of service. Morale then increases as the number of service years increase. This same trend was found in the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) study. Teachers with 3 years or less in the teaching profession had higher rates of satisfaction than their more experienced counterparts. Hulin and Smith (1965) however, did not find a U-shaped relation between age, tenure, and job satisfaction in their study of 260 workers.

Social Support

Social support and job satisfaction has been linked to the Hawthorne studies in the 1920's (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957). Workers who identify with the group are more satisfied and likely to have interpersonal and friendship needs met (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969; Maynard, 1986). Graham (1966) theorized that "social acceptance by fellow workers often proves to be a more powerful incentive for maintaining the present level of production than does the promise of increased rewards for improving productivity" (p. 547). Maynard (1986) found that individuals with a variety of support networks such as work, family, friends, and community were better

adjusted at work, and those with deficient social networks experience more stress and are less able to cope. This same finding was found in the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) study that indicated that staff members who agreed there is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff have higher levels of satisfaction than those who feel otherwise. Ducharme and Martin (2000) investigated whether social relationships in the workplace enhanced job satisfaction and whether social support mattered more to employees under the greatest job stress. Findings from the study revealed that social support significantly enhanced worker's job satisfaction.

Supervision

Worker/Supervisor relationships have been emphasized as a factor in job satisfaction since the 1920's. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) noted the attitude and effectiveness of employees are directly related to the quality of supervision provided to them. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) reported that those individuals who agree that the administration is supportive and encouraging have higher levels of satisfaction than those who perceive the administration as unsupportive. In this same study, staff members who agreed they were recognized for a job well done have higher rates of satisfaction than those who feel otherwise. Schroffel (1999) found in a study of workers serving seriously mentally ill adults that the quality of the supervision was more important to the workers than the quantity of it. Other studies suggested that the longer workers were in their jobs, the more they preferred indirect or laissez-faire styles of supervision. Belasco & Alutto (1972) noted that generally, participation in decision-making, especially regarding instructional methods, yields enhanced teacher job satisfaction. Along the same trend, Holdaway (1978) reported that

the teachers' lack of opportunities to participate in decision-making measures appears to be the most powerful source of teacher dissatisfaction. Vivian (1983) conducted a study to investigate the effect that certain factors had upon the relationship between job satisfaction and perceived leadership style, school size, and the time involved in non-instructional activities. The findings indicated teacher satisfaction is higher when a principal exhibits a collaborative leadership style. Davis and Wilson (2000) found a significant relationship between a principal's empowering behavior and teacher motivation. The more the principal allowed teachers to have input into the decision-making process, the higher teacher motivation and job satisfaction.

Issues Specific to Special Education

Examining issues specifically related to job satisfaction among special education teachers becomes especially important as personnel shortages in special education have been widely reported. According to Mainzer, Kozleski, and Deshler (2000), four out of every 10 special education teachers leave before their fifth year of teaching. George and George (1995) noted that in a study of 96 teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders, 36% expressed an intent to leave the field during the following year and 10% were not under contract for the following year at the time of the interview. It was further noted that 83% of the teachers who were planning to leave the profession taught in self-contained classrooms. These teachers were most commonly isolated physically and psychologically from the general school environment (George & George, 1995). Concurrently, decreased enrollments in teacher preparation programs for special education teachers have also been noted (Brownell & Smith, 1992; Rosenberg, Griffin,

Kilgore, & Carpenter, 1997; Smith-Davis & Billingsley, 1993). By 2005, over 200,000 new special education teachers will be needed (Mainzer et al., 2000).

Singer (1993) speculated that the high rate of teacher attrition in the field of emotional and behavioral disorders is symptomatic of a problem that extends well beyond the confines of any given classroom or a teacher's locus of control. In this regard, Singer is suggesting that there may be problems at the system or program levels. Abelson (1986) reported the same findings with students working with this same population. He reported that teachers of students with emotional disturbances were the least satisfied with their working conditions.

Administrative Support

Billingsley and Cross (1991) studied a sample of special education teachers that wanted to leave their jobs and transfer into a general education classroom. Lack of support and cooperation from administrative personnel were identified as major reasons for wanting to leave special education. In a similar study, Bruton (2001) found that administrative support played a significant role in retaining special education teachers. Teachers who feel adequately supported in their efforts to include students are more likely to report being successful in their efforts (Bennett, Deluca, & Bruns, 1997; Gemmel-Crosby & Hanzlik, 1994; Wolery, Werts, Caldwell, Snyder, & Liskowski, 1995) Lawrenson and McKinnon (1982) found that conflicts with administrators were cited as reasons for attrition among teachers of students with behavioral disorders. Lombardi and Donaldson (1987) found similar results in a survey of rural special education teachers. Fifty percent of the teachers surveyed identified relationships with administrators as a stressor to their daily routine. Mainzer, et al. (2000) found that special educators were

dissatisfied by the support at the administrative level for purchasing alternate texts for their students, having appropriate instructional settings and inadequate professional development opportunities. Further, lack of administrative support was noted in the size of caseloads. Self-contained teachers typically carried a caseload of 18 students, while resource/consulting teachers were found to have a caseload of 38 students (Mainzer et al. 2000).

Paperwork/Responsibilities Other Than Teaching

In the study by Mainzer, Kozleski, and Deshler (2000), excessive paperwork was cited by one third of the sample as a reason for transfer requests. This finding has been substantiated by previous studies (Bensky, Shaw, Gause, Bates, Dixon & Beane, 1980; Dangel, Bunch, & Coopman, 1987; Lawrenson & McKinnon, 1982). Singer (1993) cited that while the paperwork is overwhelming, the dissatisfaction might lie with more of what the paperwork keeps the special education teacher from doing.

Mainzer, Kozleski, and Deshler (2000) indicated that while procedural compliance and the development of individual education plans are crucial, the time involved in preparing them is unmanageable. Their findings indicated the average length of the typical IEP was between 8 and 16 pages, and meetings require a minimum of 4 hours for preparation. Eighty-three percent of special education teachers in this study reported spending one-half to one and one-half days per week in IEP related meetings. These did not reflect all of the special education teacher's paperwork requirements. Completing forms, sending meeting notices, developing team meeting minutes, due process documentation, and grade reporting also consumed a great deal of time and take away from teaching.

Research suggests that special education teachers gain motivation from the intrinsic and psychological rewards associated with teaching, such as positive contacts with students and successful teaching experiences (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989). Billingsley and Cross (1991) postulated that special education teachers have fewer opportunities to obtain these psychological rewards due to the tremendous amounts of paperwork demanded by their jobs. This certainly contributes to the possibility of dissatisfaction and desire to leave the profession. Mainzer, Kozleski, and Deshler (2000) report that 68% of special education teachers spend less than two hours per week in individual instruction with their students. Granted, much of this time may be spent in a collaborative teaching model, it still demonstrates the fact that special educators are drawn away from their primary purpose of teaching due to other demands upon them.

Stress

Fimian and Blanton (1986) focused on stress and job dissatisfaction as factors in job attrition. Among teachers, a strong inverse relationship between levels of stress and job satisfaction has been noted (Sutton & Huberty, 1984). This connection between stress and dissatisfaction has especially been noted in special education teachers (Eichinger, 2000). Crane and Iwanicki (1986), in a survey of special education teachers, found that teachers reported feeling unable to cope with the stresses of dealing with students with disabilities. Miller, Brownell, and Smith (1999) reported that special education teachers who left the profession were higher in perceived stress than those who stayed in the field. Weiskopf (1980) reported stressors among teachers of exceptional children such as a heavy workload, and the pressure to complete tasks in a timely manner. Special education teachers also perceived a lack of success due to the child's

actual problems, or unrealistic goals on the part of the teacher. These perceptions in turn lowered the teacher's self-confidence and heightened frustration which is often followed by job dissatisfaction (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978).

Perceptions of Alienation and Isolation

With regard to support and professional status in schools, special educators have been treated as second-class citizens in comparison with their general education peers (Meredith & Underwood, 1995). As students with disabilities have been placed in the general education classroom, disharmony between general educators and special educators has grown. On the part of the special educator, the perception has commonly been that general educators do not want students with disabilities in their classrooms (Gersten, Gillman, Morvant, & Billingsley, 1995). This perception was corroborated by Criswell, Anderson, Slate, and Jones (1993) as they found that general education teachers expressed overall negative attitudes toward special educators and the students they serve due to the following reasons: 1) general educators generally have large classes which make individualization and modifications for students with disabilities difficult, and 2) general educators may be overwhelmed with the demands placed upon them with the size of the class and the diversity of needs of students with disabilities placed in their classes.

On a positive note, the collaborative model of inclusion seems to have brought some sense of respect to the special education profession as general educators are able to benefit from the expertise provided by the special education teacher (Beckman, 2001). General educators also have the opportunity to gain a better understanding of working with students with disabilities by using varied approaches to learning, modifying

curriculum, and providing emotional support to students. Despite these gains as a result of inclusion, this model of service delivery brings about its own set of problems.

Theoretically, when a special educator works within the general education model, a partnership should be used with both teachers having an equal say in the delivery of services. However, Hanson (1996) indicated reports of lesser roles by the special educator in the classroom. Special educators might take on lesser roles in the classroom such as passing out papers or erasing the board. Special educators might be left completely out of planning daily lessons, which leaves their input out of modifications for students in the classroom. This leaves the special educator with the impression that their input into instruction is unimportant and they are not on equal footing in the eyes of administrators, teachers, and students.

Shoho and Katims (1998) found that special education teachers reported significantly higher levels of alienation in three areas, isolation, a feeling of not being part of the norm (normless), and a feeling of not being able to influence one's choices in a given environment (powerless). While research indicates that students gain psychosocial benefits from being in an inclusive environment, Shoho and Katims (1998) found no significant differences in feelings of isolation, normlessness, and feeling powerless between special education teachers in resource rooms and those in the inclusive setting.

These issues certainly make the job of the special educator difficult at best. The trend in special education appears to be one of placing more responsibilities upon the teacher without providing resources and materials to get the job done effectively. It is

important to note these responsibilities only become more complex when teachers are expected to collaborate, consult, or team teach with their general education counterparts.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The final portion of this review of literature focuses on The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Short Form) (MSQ), which was used to gather data in this study. It was chosen for three significant reasons. As a research instrument, the MSQ addresses intrinsic and extrinsic variables that have been found to predict teacher job satisfaction. Secondly, the MSQ not only addresses intrinsic and extrinsic variables, but also examines general satisfaction. Thirdly, the MSQ is brief in nature. It has twenty items in a Likert-type format with an accompanying demographic data sheet, which was modified by this researcher to gather more specific data about each participant.

Several questions were added to the demographic portion of the questionnaire. These questions addressed age, marital status, highest degree earned, years of teaching experience, and current level of pay. Three questions were also added to specifically address the role of the teacher in the school and the method of teaching incorporated when working with students with disabilities. These questions asked whether the teacher was a general or special education teacher, if collaboration or co-teaching was used in the classroom, and if students with disabilities were included in the same settings as their peers without disabilities.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed in 1967 by David J. Weiss, Rene V. Dawis, George W. England, and Lloyd H. Lofquist of the Work Adjustment Project Studies at the University of Minnesota's Industrial Relations Center. The Work Adjustment Theory, on which the questionnaire is based, suggests that job

satisfaction is a function of a person's vocational needs and the reinforcement of those needs through the work environment. Weiss et al. (1967) state that "work adjustment depends on how well an individual's abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work, and how well his needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment" (p. v). Weiss et al. maintain that "satisfaction and satisfactoriness are measurable indicators of work adjustment, and that they can be measured independently of each other" (p. v).

The MSQ addresses both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that affect job satisfaction. The intrinsic motivators include questions covering activity, independence, variety, social status, value, security, social service, authority, and utilization of ability, responsibility, creativity, and achievement. The extrinsic motivators include questions covering human relations supervision, technical supervision, policy, compensation, advancement, and recognition. The General Satisfaction score is calculated using all twenty questions.

In a review of the MSQ, Albright (in Buros, 1972) suggested that the reliability seems to be quite satisfactory. An analysis of internal consistency reveals that reliability coefficients for all twenty scales plus general job satisfaction yielded a 0.80 coefficient or higher on 83% of the 567 coefficients. Stability coefficients ranged from 0.66 to 0.99 with a median of 0.83 when administered after one week. When retested one year later, correlations ranged between 0.35 and 0.71 with a median of 0.61. In a cross-validated study of different occupational groups, it was concluded that the MSQ achieved better than chance predictions of general job satisfaction. Albright further stated that the test seems complete enough to serve adequately as a measure of general job satisfaction. The

brevity of the test may also facilitate participation by respondents because of the five minutes required to complete the questionnaire. Guion (in Buros, 1978) supported Albright's evaluation, stating "the MSQ gives reasonable, reliable, valid, well-normed indications of general satisfaction, collapsible into intrinsic and extrinsic components" (p. 1052).

According to the authors of the instrument, evidence in support of construct validity was supported indirectly from construct validation studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire, based on the Theory of Work Adjustment ... analysis of the data yielded good evidence of construct validity for the Ability Utilization, Advancement, and Variety scales of the MIQ, and therefore indirectly for the same scales of the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire has been used in numerous studies to measure levels of job satisfaction. Mason (1981) used the questionnaire to compare job satisfaction between administrators and teachers. Rhodes-Offutt (1990) noted that early childhood educators' perceptions of job satisfaction were related to grade level experience, teaching experience, life satisfaction, ethnicity, and salary. Cooley and Yovanoff (1996) used the MSQ as part of their study to evaluate interventions to reduce burnout and improve retention of special educators. Thorsen-Spano (1996) used the MSQ to assess the impact of a conflict resolution program upon teacher job satisfaction. Walker (1996) studied job satisfaction between teachers in both magnet and non-magnet schools in Indianapolis. Chen, Blendinger, and McGrath (2000) used the MSQ to examine job satisfaction in high school assistant principals in Mississippi. Newby (1999) examined the job satisfaction of Virginia middle school principals. Miller (2000) used

the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to assess job satisfaction among teachers in member schools of the southeast region of the Association of Christian Schools International. Walker (2001) investigated the job satisfaction of teachers in the Tennessee Association of Christian Schools. In each of these studies, the MSQ has demonstrated reliable and valid results.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Chapter III contains the nature of the population and sample, the sampling procedure, the description of the data collection instrument, the methods and procedures used in collecting data, and data analysis.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was the 619 full-time general and special education teachers in the 13 public elementary schools containing grades K-5 participating in the Georgia Department of Education program known as Project WINning Team (Complete description in Appendix A), and 578 teachers from 13 demographically matched elementary schools (non Project WINning Team) containing the same grade levels. These schools represented 14 school systems that participated in the project. Each school within both sets of schools contained an overall school population of 600 students or greater. Schools in Project WINning Team (PWT) used inclusion as the primary model of special education service delivery, while their corresponding schools used resource/pull-out as the primary special education service delivery model. All schools in the study had less than 20% of their student populations receiving special education services. The total teacher population was 1,197 teachers. The number of schools and student enrollment data were obtained from the Georgia Department of Education with statistics coming specifically from the Office of Technology Services' Georgia Public Education Report Card for 2001-2002. Student enrollment in PWT schools is 10,081, and the matched schools' population is 9,499 students. The total student population is 19,580.

Seven (53.9%) of PWT schools, representing 61.5% of all systems participating, were randomly selected using a Table of Random Numbers (Leedy, 1997). Selection was conducted using the following steps: 1) a starting point was randomly selected, using a different Table of Random Numbers (Gay & Airasian, 2000); 2) PWT schools were listed alphabetically; 3) using the last two digits in the random numbers, the schools were selected in order of the listing of their assigned random number until the designated number of schools were selected.

The other seven elementary schools (non-PWT) were matched with the PWT schools based on demographic and statistical data (student population, and percent receiving special education services). These schools were selected from a list from the Georgia Department of Education that indicated all elementary schools in each of the systems of the PWT schools.

Instrumentation

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to collect data for this study. The Work Adjustment Theory, on which the questionnaire is based, suggests that job satisfaction is a function of a person's vocational needs and the reinforcement of the work environment.

The long form of the MSQ contains 100 items and is divided into twenty scales (see Table 1). Each scale consists of five items. For the purpose of this study, the short form of MSQ was used due to its brevity and ease of completion. This instrument consists of twenty items. Each item corresponds with a specific scale as indicated in the MSQ Manual (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

Table 1: MSQ Scales, Items, and Corresponding Subscales

Scale	Item	Subscale
Ability Utilization	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.	Intrinsic
Achievement	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.	Intrinsic
Activity	Being able to keep busy all the time.	Intrinsic
Advancement	The chances for advancement on this job.	Extrinsic
Authority	The chance to tell other people what to do.	Intrinsic
School Policy	The way school policies are put into practice.	Extrinsic
Compensation	My pay and the amount of work I do.	Extrinsic
Co-Workers	The way my co-workers get along with each other.	General
Creativity	The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.	Intrinsic
Independence	The chance to work alone on the job.	Intrinsic
Moral Values	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.	Intrinsic
Recognition	The praise I get for doing a good job.	Extrinsic
Responsibility	The freedom to use my own judgment.	Intrinsic
Security	The way my job provides for steady employment.	Intrinsic
Social Service	The chance to do things for other people.	Intrinsic
Social Status	The chance to be "somebody" in the community.	Intrinsic
Supervision (HR)	The way my principal handles his/her faculty.	Extrinsic
Supervision (Technical)	The competence of my principal in making decisions.	Extrinsic
Variety	The chance to do different things from time to time.	Intrinsic
Working Conditions	The working conditions	General

The long form of the MSQ contains 100 items and is divided into twenty scales (see Table 1). Each scale consists of five items. For the purpose of this study, the short form of MSQ was used due to its brevity and ease of completion. This instrument consists of twenty items. Each item corresponds with a specific scale as indicated in the MSQ Manual (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

These twenty questions on the short form are broken down into three subscales, intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. The intrinsic motivators include questions covering activity, independence, variety, social status, value, security, social service, authority, utilization of ability, responsibility, creativity, and achievement. The extrinsic motivators include questions covering human relations supervision (HR), technical supervision (Tech), policy, compensation, advancement, and recognition. The General Satisfaction score is calculated using the two intrinsic and extrinsic subscales along with questions on co-worker relationships and working conditions.

Modification of the MSQ (short form) for the Study

The short form of the MSQ was modified by this researcher. This was necessary for two reasons. First, questions on the MSQ were developed for non-educational settings and the wording on some of them needed to be modified for an educational environment. Secondly, demographic questions were modified to add job-related factors that may impact the job satisfaction of general and special education teachers. Permission to make these modifications to the MSQ short-form was obtained from Dr. David Weiss, Director of the Vocational Psychology Research Department at the University of Minnesota, who is also one of the developers of the MSQ. The changes in the questions are shown in Appendix H.

Supplemental Questions

The demographic section of the MSQ was not used in this study. Instead, a personal descriptors page that addressed personal (teacher) and professional (school) characteristics was used. Personal characteristics included age, gender, marital status, highest degree earned, and current level of pay. Professional characteristics included years of teaching experience, classification of teaching position (general/special education), participation in an inclusive classroom, and use of collaboration/co-teaching in teaching students with disabilities. This is provided in Appendix E.

Procedures

A letter was written to the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota requesting permission to use the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Included in this letter was an explanation of the study as well as an indication that appropriate credit would be given to the University of Minnesota for use of the instrument (Appendix B).

After the random selection of schools, a request to administer the survey, accompanied by a detailed outline of the research study was submitted to the superintendent of each school system (Appendix C). Included in the letter were the sample letters that were to be mailed to both the principal of each participating school and teachers involved in the survey.

Upon the receipt of permission to conduct the study from the superintendent, the principal at each school was contacted by telephone and sent a letter requesting permission to survey his/her teachers. The letter included a copy of the *permission to conduct research* letter from the system superintendent. A postage-paid response card

was included in order for the principal to indicate an agreement to participate in the survey as well as the number of surveys needed for all full-time faculty at the facility. The principal was asked to facilitate the distribution and collection of the surveys and to return all surveys by the return deadline date, which was four weeks from the initial mailing.

When the permission to survey was obtained from each principal, survey packets were sent to each school, which included a cover letter for the principal, survey packets for each teacher, and a postage-paid return mailer for the principal to use in order to return the surveys. The teacher packets included the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Short Form) accompanied by a personal data form, cover letter, and an informed consent page (Appendix D). Envelopes were included in each teacher's packet to ensure confidentiality of responses as teachers returned surveys in sealed envelopes to principals. The components of the cover letter included:

1. A request for voluntary participation noting the responses as being valuable to education.
2. A brief explanation concerning completion of the questionnaire.
3. Usefulness of the study.
4. An assurance of anonymity.
5. Appreciation for the respondent's assistance.
6. A statement indicating that the results of the survey will be sent to each participating school.

Respondents were asked to complete and return the questionnaire and data form to their principal, who returned all questionnaires for the school within two weeks in the

enclosed mailer. Three weeks after the questionnaire was mailed, a postcard reminder was sent to each school principal (Appendix C), which reminded them of the deadline and requested they remind their teachers to return the surveys.

Statistical Analysis

The Mann-Whitney *U* test, which is used in testing data to determine differences between dependent variables (Hinkle, Jurs, & Wiersma, 1998), was used with Research Question One. This analysis was used to test whether there was a significant difference in the responses to the twenty job satisfaction scales on the MSQ based on the teachers' personal, educational, professional descriptors. These descriptors included age, degree, gender, teaching classification (type), marital status, salary, teaching experience, if co-teaching was used, and whether students with disabilities are included in the general classroom (inclusion).

Data collection produced scored responses for the items in each scale, which are the Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and General Job Satisfaction Scales. The response choices on each item were assigned values in the following manner on a Likert-type scale:

Response Choice	Scoring
Very Dissatisfied	1
Dissatisfied	2
Neutral	3
Satisfied	4
Very Satisfied	5

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used with Research Questions One and Two. For each question, this test was used to determine if there is a difference in the means of the various satisfaction subscores (intrinsic, extrinsic, and

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter contains six sections. The first section contains the purpose of the research study. The next section states the null hypotheses used in this study. The following section describes the response rate of the selected population. The next section provides a demographic cross section and a nondemographic description of the teachers participating in the research. The following section describes the statistical treatment of the survey data and addresses the findings and analysis of the data in relation to the four research questions. The final section presents a summary of the findings of the research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction of elementary level general and special educators implementing the inclusion model as compared to elementary level general and special education teachers who use more traditional models of special education service delivery such as resource or pull-out models of instruction.

Research Question Null Hypotheses

1. There is no difference in the responses of elementary level general and special education teachers on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ).

2. Based on teacher classification, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method, there is no difference for the following MSQ subscales:

   a. Intrinsic Satisfaction
   b. Extrinsic Satisfaction

c. General Satisfaction

MSQ Response Rate

The population of the survey was comprised of full-time teachers in 26 elementary schools in Georgia. The number of teachers in all schools was 1,197. The surveyed sample included 514 teachers.

Five hundred fourteen surveys were mailed in mid-March. Out of 514 mailed, 380 were returned, which resulted in a response rate of 73.9 percent. Eight surveys were eliminated from the total number of surveys returned, resulting in a usable response rate of 72.3 percent. An examination of the invalid surveys revealed that five of the respondents were counselors, two were physical education teachers, and one was a foreign language teacher. These teachers were not considered full-time classroom teachers and their surveys were eliminated from the sample.

Demographic Cross Section of Surveyed Teachers

In order to build a better understanding of the teachers involved in this study, demographic information based on survey responses will be presented. Each variable is presented in tabular format with an explanation of the table included beneath it.

The first variable consists of the age groups of teachers (see Table 2). The 30-39 and 40-49 age groups each represented approximately one third of the total respondents. The 20-29 and 50-59 age groups combined accounted for exactly one-third of the teachers. In the 60+ age group, there were only four respondents, accounting for 1.1 percent of the teachers.

Table 2: Age of Teachers

Age Range	Number	Percent
20-29	54	14.5
30-39	132	35.5
40-49	112	30.1
50-59	70	18.8
60+	4	1.1
TOTAL	372	100.0

The second variable is gender (see Table 3). Males accounted for 12 of the respondents, or 3.2 percent of the total respondents. The majority of the respondents were female, who accounted for 360, or 96.8 percent.

The marital status of respondents comprises the third variable (see Table 4). Single teachers made up 9.1 percent or 34 respondents. Widowed teachers were 2.4 percent or 9 respondents. Twenty-one, or 5.6 percent, of the respondents were divorced. Married teachers made up the bulk of the respondents with 308, or 82.8 percent.

Teachers with undergraduate degrees (see Table 5) made up the bulk of the sample with 177, or 47.6 percent. Respondents with master's degrees made up 41.1 percent or 153 cases of the sample. Teachers with specialist degrees comprised 10.5 percent or 39 cases, while those with doctoral status only made up 3 cases, or 0.8 percent.

Teachers with one to three years of experience accounted for 11.8 percent of the overall sample with 44 cases (see Table 6). Teachers with four to seven years of experience accounted for 18.8 percent of the sample with 70 cases. Teachers with eight to fifteen years of experience comprised 30.6 percent of the sample with 114 cases. The

Table 3: Gender of Teachers

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	12	3.2
Female	360	96.8
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 4: Marital Status of Teachers

Marital Status	Number	Percent
Single	34	9.1
Married	308	82.8
Widowed	9	2.4
Divorced	21	5.6
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 5: Educational Degrees of Teachers

Degree	Number	Percent
Undergraduate	177	47.6
Master's	153	41.1
Specialist	39	10.5
Doctorate	3	0.8
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 6: Teacher Years of Experience

Years of Experience	Number	Percent
1-3	44	11.8
4-7	70	18.8
8-15	114	30.6
16+	144	38.7
TOTAL	372	100.0

largest grouping consisted of those teachers with 16+ years of experience. This group comprised 38.7 percent or 144 cases.

The sixth variable consisted of teacher salaries (see Table 7). Teachers making between $40,000 and $49,999 comprised the largest group in the sample with 145 cases or 39.0 percent. Those respondents making between $30,000 and $39,999 accounted for 38.2 percent or 142 cases. Teachers making more than $49,999 per year accounted for 18 percent of the sample or 67 cases. Finally, teachers making between $20,000 and $29,999 made up 4.8 percent of the sample, or 18 cases.

As presented in Table 8, General education teachers accounted for 83.3 percent of the sample with 310 cases. Special education teachers accounted for 16.7 percent of the sample with 62 cases.

Teachers serving students with disabilities in the general classroom (inclusion) accounted for 62.4 percent of the sample or 232 cases (see Table 9). Teachers serving students with disabilities in traditional models of service delivery such as resource or pull-out accounted for 37.6 percent of the sample or 140 cases.

Table 7: Teacher Salaries in Dollars

Salary Range	Number	Percent
20,000-29,999	18	4.8
30,000-39,999	142	38.2
40,000-49,999	145	39.0
50,000+	67	18.0
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 8: Teacher Classification

Classification	Number	Percent
General Education	310	83.3
Special Education	62	16.7
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 9: Special Education Service Delivery Model

Service Delivery Model	Number	Percent
Inclusion	232	62.4
Non-Inclusion	140	37.6
TOTAL	372	100.0

Table 10: Co-Teaching

Co-Teaching	Number	Percent
Yes	205	55.1
No	167	44.9
TOTAL	372	100.0

Teachers who used a collaborative or co-teaching model in teaching students with disabilities accounted for 55.1 percent of the sample or 205 cases (see Table 10). Teachers who did not use a collaborative or co-teaching model in teaching students with disabilities accounted for 44.9 percent of the sample, or 167 cases.

Description of Responses

The means and standard deviations of respondents satisfaction on the twenty scales of the MSQ Short form are presented in rank order in Table 11. A five point Likert-type scale was used to indicate the degree of satisfaction: 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = dissatisfied; 3 = neutral; 4 = satisfied; and 5 = very satisfied.

Teachers indicated a satisfaction level between satisfied and very satisfied for 14 of the scales while indicating a satisfaction between neutral and satisfied on four of them. One scale showed teacher responses being in between dissatisfied and neutral.

The two highest mean satisfaction scores occurred in Security (4.56), which relates to steady employment, and Social Service (4.55), which relates to doing things for others in the community. Ability Utilization (4.50), Supervision – Technical (4.48), and Supervision – Human relations (4.40) complete the top five mean satisfaction scores. Ability Utilization, which relates to the teacher's perception of being able to use abilities

Table 11: Mean Satisfaction Scores on the Twenty Scales of the MSQ Short Form

Scale	Type	Mean	Standard Deviation
Security	Intrinsic	4.56	.70
Social Service	Intrinsic	4.55	.62
Ability Utilization	Intrinsic	4.50	.67
Supervision --- Technical	Extrinsic	4.48	.81
Supervision --- Human Relations	Extrinsic	4.40	.86
Activity	Intrinsic	4.38	.73
Moral Values	Intrinsic	4.34	.77
Variety	Intrinsic	4.33	.76
Achievement	Intrinsic	4.31	.78
Working Conditions	General	4.27	.85
Creativity	Intrinsic	4.24	.86
Responsibility	Intrinsic	4.16	.82
Co-workers	General	4.10	.91
Social Status	Intrinsic	4.04	.79
Recognition	Extrinsic	3.99	.94
Independence	Intrinsic	3.94	.88
School Policies	Extrinsic	3.84	.99
Advancement	Extrinsic	3.66	.89
Authority	Intrinsic	3.61	.77
Compensation	Extrinsic	2.66	1.02

in the school, is an intrinsic variable. Supervision --- Technical relates to the teacher's perception of principal competence, while Supervision --- Human relations relates to the teacher's perception of how the principal manages the faculty. Both of these scales are extrinsic in nature.

It can be seen that teachers in this study expressed a higher degree of satisfaction in the areas of intrinsic satisfaction as opposed to extrinsic satisfaction. It is important to note that while the lowest mean occurred in the area of compensation, an extrinsic scale, teachers expressed an overall feeling of satisfaction with extrinsic variables. The data indicate that teachers participating in the study find the highest satisfaction in their jobs in the areas of having steady employment, being of service to others in the community, and being able to use their skills fully. Extrinsically, teachers in the study find the most satisfaction in the way their administrator makes competent decisions and how the administration manages the faculty. In terms of dissatisfaction, only one scale, which was extrinsic in nature, was found to fall into the dissatisfied category. Teachers indicated being dissatisfied with the amount of compensation received in relation to the amount of work done.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

Data were analyzed using SPSS Version 11.0 for Windows statistical software. Of the 380 surveys returned, 372 produced usable responses giving an overall response rate of 72.9 percent. In an examination of the survey data, it was found that in some cases, descriptors representing teachers' personal, educational, and professional characteristics

were too small, representing values less than five. In these cases, the descriptors were collapsed. These will be identified in the section in which they are described.

It was also found that responses to the "very dissatisfied" category of the Likert-type scale were low in frequency in 19 out of 20 scales. As a result, the "very dissatisfied" and "dissatisfied" categories were collapsed into a "dissatisfied" category to improve the quality of the data analysis.

The Mann-Whitney *U* analysis (two-tailed) was used for Hypothesis 1. Acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis was based on a .05 level of significance. When significant differences occurred, an examination of the ranks was used in order to determine the degree of difference between the two dependent variables.

A Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for Research Questions 1 and 2. Acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses was based on a .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states there is no difference in the responses of elementary level general and special education teachers on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ).

Three of the twenty satisfaction scales, Achievement, Social Status and Variety, were found to be statistically significant at a 0.05 level of significance. In each scale, the null hypothesis was rejected. General education teachers demonstrated higher levels of satisfaction in all three areas. Table 12 presents a summary of the findings.

Table 12: Mean Rankings and Significances Based Upon Teacher Type

Scale	Gen. Ed.	Sp. Ed.	Significance
Ability Utilization	188.59	176.07	.337
Achievement	192.19	158.03	.010*
Activity	187.36	182.19	.700
Advancement	188.05	178.77	.501
Authority	185.82	189.91	.766
School Policy	185.00	194.00	.516
Compensation	185.69	190.55	.720
Co-Workers	188.05	178.77	.496
Creativity	187.74	180.31	.586
Independence	189.23	172.85	.240
Moral Values	186.04	188.80	.838
Recognition	190.22	167.88	.105
Responsibility	188.30	177.50	.420
Security	186.77	185.17	.899
Social Service	187.30	182.48	.707
Social Status	191.78	160.10	.021*
Supervision (HR)	184.58	196.10	.384
Supervision (Tech)	186.87	184.63	.862
Variety	191.62	160.91	.022*
Working Conditions	189.01	173.95	.266

Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a states that there is no difference in the means of the intrinsic satisfaction subscales of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method.

Based on the analysis of variance of the three variables and the interactions between them, none were found to be significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis is accepted. Table 13 presents a summary of the MANOVA data.

Hypothesis 2b

Hypothesis 2b states that there is no difference in the means of the extrinsic satisfaction subscales of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method.

Based on the analysis of variance of the three variables and the interactions between them, none were found to be significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis is accepted. Table 14 presents a summary of the MANOVA data.

Hypothesis 2c

Hypothesis 2c states that there is no difference in the means of the general satisfaction subscale of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method. Based on the analysis of variance of the three variables and the interactions between them, none were found to be significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis is accepted. Table 15 presents a summary of the MANOVA data.

Table 13: Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Teacher Classification, Teaching Model, and Teaching Method and the MSQ Intrinsic Satisfaction Subscale

Variable	Group	Size	DF	F Ratio	Sig.
Type	Gen. Ed.	310	1	.223	.637
	Sp. Ed.	62			
Inclusion	Yes	232	1	.426	.514
	No	140			
Co-Teaching	Yes	205	1	.036	.849
	No	167			
Type and Inclusion			1	.031	.860
Type and Co-Teaching			1	.082	.774
Inclusion and Co-Teaching			1	.396	.530
Type and Inclusion and Co-teaching			1	.082	.775

Table 14: Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Teacher Classification, Teaching Model, and Teaching Method and the MSQ Extrinsic Satisfaction Subscale

Variable	Group	Size	DF	F Ratio	Sig.
Type	Gen. Ed.	310	1	.161	.688
	Sp. Ed.	62			
Inclusion	Yes	232	1	1.296	.256
	No	140			
Co-Teaching	Yes	205	1	.068	.794
	No	167			
Type and Inclusion			1	.086	.769
Type and Co-Teaching			1	.432	.512
Inclusion and Co-Teaching			1	2.769	.097
Type and Inclusion and Co-teaching			1	.142	.707

Table 15: Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Teacher Classification, Teaching Model, and Teaching Method and the MSQ General Satisfaction Subscale

Variable	Group	Size	DF	F Ratio	Sig.
Type	Gen. Ed.	310	1	.046	.831
	Sp. Ed.	62			
Inclusion	Yes	232	1	.833	.362
	No	140			
Co-Teaching	Yes	205	1	.065	.798
	No	167			
Type and Inclusion			1	.020	.887
Type and Co-Teaching			1	.000	.997
Inclusion and Co-Teaching			1	1.150	.284
Type and Inclusion and Co-teaching			1	.074	.786

Summary

For Hypothesis 1, mean statistical differences (.05 level, two-tailed) were found for the MSQ scales of Achievement, Social Status, and Variety. In each case general education teachers reported greater satisfaction than their special education counterparts. For Hypotheses 2a-c, no statistically significant differences (.05, two-tailed) were found between general and special education teachers' mean responses on the MSQ intrinsic, extrinsic, or general satisfaction scales.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter V consists of three sections. The first section contains a discussion drawn from the significant findings of the research study. The second section consists of conclusions derived from the study. The third section contains recommendations and recommendations for further research.

Discussion

Surveys were analyzed using the Mann Whitney analysis (.05 level of significance, two-tailed) for Research Question 1 and multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) for Research Questions 2a through 2c. The statistical treatment of the data was described in Chapter IV.

The results of the statistical treatment will be discussed through each of the following research questions:

1) *Is there a difference in the responses of elementary level general and special education teachers on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ)?*

In relation to the individual scales, classification of teachers proved to be statistically significant in three areas, Achievement, Social Status, and Variety, which were all intrinsic in nature. The findings in achievement are supported by Shoho and Katims (1998), who found that special education teachers felt powerless to influence their choices in the general education environment. These feelings of being powerless would certainly impact the daily feelings of effectiveness and accomplishment of teachers.

Social Status was significant, possibly due to a perception of feeling powerless, as found by Hanson (1996), or being viewed as less important than their general education counterparts. Further, as indicated by Criswell et al. (1993), general educators have been found to have negative attitudes toward special educators as a result of having students with disabilities within their already overpopulated classrooms. Social status has been shown to be affected due to perceptions of alienation and isolation by the special educators (Meredith & Underwood, 1995).

Variety was significant with general educators showing higher levels of satisfaction than their special education counterparts. For the special education teachers limited to teaching students in the resource classroom, it may be that their options for variety are somewhat limited as they may be segregated from students with higher levels of academic ability. For teachers involved in the inclusion model, it is this writer's thought that special educators might see their roles as limited within the confines of the general education classroom. Hanson (1996) reported that special educators reported being in lesser roles in the general education classroom, such as passing out papers or simply erasing the board. In some cases, Hanson indicated that special educators might be left completely out of planning daily lessons, leaving them with a minimal role in the daily educational routine.

2a) Is there a difference in the means of the intrinsic satisfaction subscales of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method?

There were no differences in the means of the intrinsic satisfaction subscale of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, or teaching method. The null hypothesis was accepted.

In Hypothesis 1, three out of twelve of the intrinsic scales were found to be significant. However, in Hypothesis 2a, when the sum of all twelve intrinsic scales was compared in a multivariate analysis of variance with teacher type, teaching method, and delivery model, no significant difference was found. It is this writer's speculation that through the collaborative model, especially in a school or system that is supportive of the Least Restrictive Environment initiative, general and special education teachers benefit from the opportunities provided from working together. In this writer's opinion, the sense of achievement, improved social status, and variety brought from working in a classroom with a broad spectrum of students, would have a positive impact on the intrinsic nature of a teacher's job satisfaction, especially when working with another teacher to achieve common goals. This notion is supported by Beckman (2001), who indicated that the collaborative model has demonstrated improved relations between general and special educators. Bennet et al. (1997), Gemmel-Crosby & Hanzlik (1994), and Wolery, Werts, Caldwell, Snyder, & Liskowski (1995) substantiated these findings as they found that teachers who felt supported reported being successful in their efforts.

2b) Is there a difference in the means of the extrinsic satisfaction subscales of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method?

There were no differences in the means of the extrinsic satisfaction subscale of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The six questions on the extrinsic subscale addressed opportunities for advancement, compensation, recognition, school policy, principal administrative ability, and principal competence in making decisions. Based on a review of the literature, opportunities for advancement have not been found to significantly affect job satisfaction.

With regard to compensation, many studies have provided mixed results. Jennings (2001) in a study of job satisfaction in a Mississippi Delta County found that many teachers were unsatisfied with compensation in pay and benefits. A study by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) also found that teachers making less than $25,000 per year had a higher percentage reporting being satisfied than their co-workers who received higher compensation. Spector (1997) noted that workers tend to compare themselves to each other and are more concerned with equality in pay policies than in salary differences.

Recognition and adminstrative issues will be discussed together as the review of literature found overlapping themes between them. It was found in the majority of studies that teachers were more satisfied in environments in which they had an opportunity to participate in decision making and were recognized for their efforts. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) reported that those individuals who agree that the administration is supportive and encouraging have higher levels of satisfaction than those who perceive the administration as unsupportive. In this same study, staff members who agreed they were recognized for a job well-done have higher rates of

satisfaction than those who feel otherwise. Schroffel (1999) found in a study of workers serving seriously mentally ill adults that the quality of the supervision was more important to the workers than the quantity of it. Along the same trend, Holdaway (1978) reported that the teachers' lack of opportunities to participate in decision-making measures appears to be the most powerful source of teacher dissatisfaction. Vivian (1983) indicated teacher satisfaction is higher when a principal exhibits a collaborative leadership style. Davis and Wilson (2000) found the more the principal allowed teachers to have input into the decision-making process, the higher teacher motivation and job satisfaction.

2c) Is there a difference in the means of the general satisfaction subscales of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method?

There were no differences in the means of the general satisfaction subscale of the MSQ based on the teachers' classifications, model of special education service delivery, and teaching method. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The general satisfaction subscales were a compilation of both intrinsic and extrinsic subscales and two questions covering co-worker interactions and the working conditions. As mentioned in Hypothesis 1, the opportunity for individuals to work together in a collaborative manner with common goals has been shown to be a positive force in the job satisfaction of teachers despite an initial adjustment period in which roles are defined and relationships are established. With regard to working conditions, the study by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997), it was found that workplace

conditions had a positive relationship with job satisfaction regardless of school type or demographics.

In looking at the results for questions 2a through 2c, it is this writer's belief that the results of the study were impacted by several factors. First, schools that participated in the Project WINning Team program were influenced by support, training, and funding as part of the grant at the school level. Secondly, schools participating in this study were members of school systems that indicated support of the least restrictive environment initiative as shown by their participation in PWT at a system level. While all schools weren't PWT schools, the system of membership was an active participant.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction of elementary level general and special educators implementing the inclusion model as compared to elementary level general and special education teachers who use more traditional models of special education service delivery such as resource or pull-out models of instruction. Based on the analysis of data in Hypothesis 1, special education teachers were less satisfied than their general education counterparts in the areas of achievement, variety, and social status.

Based on the analysis of data in Hypotheses 2a – 2c, there were no differences on the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction scales of the MSQ based on teacher classification, model of service delivery, and method of instruction.

Recommendations

In looking at the findings of this study, several recommendations are suggested with regard to improving the job satisfaction of both general and special education

teachers. These recommendations are based on Hypotheses 1-2c and the four lowest mean responses on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form. The four lowest levels of satisfaction were Compensation, Advancement, Authority, and School Policy. Compensation was the only scale with a categorically dissatisfied response. Advancement, Authority, and School Policy received mean responses of neutrality. The following recommendations are only applicable to the teachers and schools that participated in this study.

1. Based on the results of Hypothesis 1, it is this writer's recommendation that support systems should be developed with schools to assist general and special education teachers in collaborating effectively. Administrators in the local school as well as in the school system should work to ensure that the roles of each teacher in a classroom are perceived as equal between general and special educators. By doing this, intrinsic satisfaction may be increased in the areas of achievement, social status, and variety.
2. Based on an examination of the lowest mean scores of the twenty MSQ scales, compensation should be made a priority and examined for inequalities despite the limited funding options available. Other options for funding should be investigated so that compensation may be increased.
3. Opportunities for leadership should be provided to teachers within schools and their respective systems. Along with these opportunities interested teachers should be given training in collaborative management styles that focus on shared decision making as opposed to an authoritative style alone.

4. Teachers wishing to advance within the school system should be encouraged to pursue advanced degrees which might increase their opportunities for advancement. School systems should make efforts to identify potential leaders within the teaching ranks and provide opportunities for leadership training and administrative apprenticeships.
5. Policies at the school level should be structured so that teachers have an active role in developing them. Shared decision making and ownership into the school policies should be encouraged.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study suggest the following recommendations for further research:

1. This study should be replicated within the same population with survey coding to separate teachers in PWT schools from non-PWT schools. By using this approach a comparison could be made between the two groups.
2. This study should be conducted in systems that are not currently involved in Least Restrictive Environment initiatives or grants similar to Project WINning Team to see if perceptions of job satisfaction are comparable between those systems and the ones used in this study.
3. Further research should be conducted to compare the perceptions of satisfaction between general and special educators in schools receiving grants similar to Project WINning Team as opposed to demographically matched schools that are not receiving any kind of support. This would provide insight into the effectiveness of support programs and their impact upon teachers.

4. Research should be conducted on a larger scale, pulling in representative systems and schools from an entire state or region. This would provide a more diverse population and results that can be generalized to a larger segment of the population.
5. Further research should focus on policy-making procedures and the support of collaborative teaming within the school setting.
6. Further research should be conducted to identify other factors that promote job satisfaction which might not have been identified in this study.

REFERENCES

References

Abelson, G.A. (1986). A factor-analytic study of job satisfaction among special educators. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46(1), 37-43.

Anderson, W.T., Hohensil, T.H., & Brown, D.T. (1984). Job satisfaction among practcing school psychologists. School Psychology Review, 13(2), 225-230.

Bamundo, P.J., & Kopelman, R.E. (1980). The moderating effects of occupation, age, and urbanization on the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 106-123.

Banerji, M. & Dailey, R.A. (1995). A study of the effects of an inclusion model on students with specific learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28, 511-522.

Beckman, P. (2001). Access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities. Arlington, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. (ERIC EC Digest 615).

Belasco, J.A., & Alutto, J.A. (1972). Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 8, 44-58.

Bensky, J.M., Shaw, S.F., Gause, A.S., Bates, H., Dixon, G., & Beane, W.E. (1980). Public law 94-142 and stress: a problem for educators. Exceptional Children, 47, 24-29.

Bernal, D., Snyder, D., & McDaniel, M. (1998). The age and job satisfaction relationship: does its shape and strength still evade us? Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences, 53-B(5), 287-293.

Bennett, T., DeLuca, D., & Bruns, D. (1997). Putting inclusion into practice: Perspectives of teachers and parents. Exceptional Children, 64(1), 115-131.

Bhella, S.K. (1982). Principal's leadership style: does it affect teacher morale?" Education, 102, 369-377.

Billingsley, B., & Cross, L. (1991). Teacher's decision to transfer from special to general education. The Journal of Special Education, 24, 496-511.

Bockman, V.M. (1971). The herzberg controversy. Personnel Psychology, 24, 155-189.

Brayfield, A.H., Wells, R.V., & Strate, M.W. (1957). Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 41(4), 201-205.

Brief, A.P. (1998). Attitudes In and Around Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brown, M.B., Hohensil, T.H., & Brown, D.T. (1998). Job satisfaction of school psychologists in the united states. School Psychology International, 19(1), 79-89.

Brownell, M.T., & Smith, S.W. (1992). Attrition/retention of special education teachers: critique of current research and recommendations for retention efforts. Teacher Education and Special Education, 15, 229-248.

Bruton, L.R. (2001). Factors associated with special education teachers' intent to stay in teaching: The Testing of a Causal Model. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, 2001). Dissertation Abstracts International, 62, 07A

Buros, O.K. (Ed.). (1972). The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, Vol. 2. Highland Park: The Gryphon Press.

Buros, O.K. (Ed.). (1978). The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park: The Gryphon Press.

Carraher, S.M. & Buckley, M.R. (1996). Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(1), 102-109.

Chen, K., Blendinger, J., & McGrath, V. (2000). Job Satisfaction Among High School Assistant Principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY.

Chung, K.H. (1977). Motivational Theories and Practices. Columbus: Grid, Inc.

Clark, A., Oswald, A., & Warr, P. (1996). Is job satisfaction u-shaped in age? Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69, 57-81.

Cooley, E. & Yovanoff, P. (1996). Supporting professionals-at-risk: evaluating interventions to reduce burnout and improve retention of special educators. Exceptional Children, 62(4), 336-355.

Crane, S.J., & Iwanicki, E.F. (1986). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout among special education teachers. Remedial and Special Education, 7(2), 24-31.

Criswell, D., Anderson, R., Slate, J.R., & Jones, C.H. (1993). Attitudes of school personnel toward special education as a function of position, years of experience, and contact with students with disabilities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. November, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 371518)

Dangel, H.L., Bunch, A.W., & Coopman, M.P. (1987). Attrition among teachers of learning disabled students. Learning Disabilities Focus, 2, 80-86.

Davis, J., & Wilson, S.M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. The Clearing House, 73(6), 349-355.

Ducharme, L.J., & Martin, J.K. (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support, and job satisfaction. Work and Occupations, 27, (2), 223-243.

Eichinger, J. (2000). Job stress and satisfaction among special education teachers: effects of gender and social role orientation. International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 47, 399-412.

.Evans, M.G. (1969). Conceptual and operational problems in the measurement of various aspects of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53(2), 93-101.

Ewen, R.B. (1967). Weighing components of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51(1), 68-73.

Fimian, M.J., & Blanton, L.P. (1986). Variables related to stress and burnout in special education teacher trainees and first-year teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education, 9, 9-21.

Fournet, G.P., Distefano, M.K., & Pryer, M.W. (1969). Job satisfaction: issues and problems. Personnel Psychology, 19, 165-183.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L.S. (1995). What's special about special education? Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 522-530.

Gay, L.R. & Airasian, P. (2000). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Gemmell-Crosby, S., & Hanzlik, J.R. (1994). Preschool teachers' perceptions of including children with disabilities. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 29(4), 279-290.

George, N., & George, M. (1995). To leave or to stay? an exploratory study of teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Remedial and Special Education, 16(4), 227.

Gersten, R., Gillman, J., Morvant, M. & Billingsley, B. (1995). Working Condtions: Job Design for Special Educators. Paper prepared for the National Dissemination Forum on Issue Related to Special Education Teacher Satisfaction, Retention, and Attrition. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389149)

Giangreco, M.F., Baumgart, D.M.J., and Doyle, M.B. (1995). How inclusion can facilitate teaching and learning. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 273-278.

Glenn, N.D., Taylor, P.A., & Weaver, C.N. (1977). Age and job satisfaction among males and females: a multivariate, multisurvey study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(2), 189-193.

Graham, G. (1966). Job satisfaction. Personnel Journal, 45, 544-547.

Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). Understanding Job Satisfaction. New York: Macmillan.

Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.

Hanson, L. (1996). Are special educators still struggling to gain respect? CEC Today, 3, 14.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1957). Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley.

Hinkle, D.E., Jurs, S.G., & Wiersma, W. (1998). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Holdaway, E.A. (1978). Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly. 14(1), 30-47.

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper Brothers.

Hoppock, R. (1960). A twenty-seven year follow-up on job satisfaction of employed adults. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 38, 489-492.

Hulin, C.L. (1969). Sources of variation in job and life satisfaction: the tole of community and job related variables. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53(4), 279-291.

Hulin, C.L. & Smith, P.C. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48(2), 88-92.

Hulin, C.L. & Smith, P.C. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49(3), 88-92.

Ivancevich, J.M., & Donnelly, J.H. (1968). Job satisfaction research: a manageable guide for practitioners. Personnel Journal, 47, 172-177.

Jayaratne, S. (1993). The antecedents, consequences, and correlates of job satisfaction. In R.T. Golembiewski (Ed.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Jennings, M.A. (2001). A Study of the Opinions of Selected Teachers Concerning Job Satisfaction and Its Influence on the Teacher Shortage in a Representative Mississippi Delta County. (Doctoral Dissertation, Delta State University, 2001). Dissertation Abstracts International, 62, 02A.

Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., & Durham, C.C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: a core evaluation approach. Research in Organizational Behavior, 19, 151-188.

Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., Durham, C.C., & Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: the role of core evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(1), 17-34.

Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1978). Teacher stress: prevalence, sources, and symptoms. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 48, 159-167.

Lawler, E.E. (1973). Motivation in Work Organizations. Belmont: Brooks/Cole.

Lawrenson, G. & McKinnon, A.J. (1982). A survey of classroom teachers of the emotionally disturbed: attrition and burnout factors." Behavioral Disorders, 8, 41-49.

Lee, R., & Wilbur, E.R. (1985). Age, education, job tenure, salary, job characteristics, and job satisfaction: a multivariate analysis. Human Relations, 38, 781-791.

Leedy, P.D. (1997). Practical Research: Planning and Design (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Legge, K., & Mumford, E. (eds.) (1978). Designing Organizations for Satisfaction and Efficiency. Hants, England: Gower Press.

Lobban, R.K., Husted, J., & Farewell, V.T. (1998). A comparison of the effect of job demand, decision latitude, role and supervisory style on self-reported job satisfaction. Work & Stress, 12(4), 337-350.

Locke, E.A. (1970). Job satisfaction and performance: a theoretical analysis." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 484-500.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lombardi, T.P. & Donaldson, J.K. (1987). Rural education teachers respond: satisfaction with jobs and training program. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 7(4), 29-30.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: academic and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53(4), 519-569.

Martin, U., & Schinke, S.P. (1998). Organizational and individual factors influencing job satisfaction and burnout of mental health workers. Social Work in Health Care, 28(2), 51-62.

Mason, C. (1981). Roles of Secondary School Principals in Selected Cook County Suburban High Schools As Perceived by Teachers and Principals. (Doctoral Dissertation, Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(11), 4978B.

Mainzer, R., Kozleski, E., & Deshler, D. (2000). Bright Futures for Exceptional Learners: An Action Agenda to Achieve Quality Conditions for Teaching and Learning. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.cec.sped.org/spotlight/cond/index.html

Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row.

Maynard, M. (1986). Measuring work and support network satisfaction. Journal of Employment Counseling, 23, 9-19.

McArthur, C., & Stevens, L.B. (1955). The validation of expressed interests as compared with inventoried interests: a fourteen year follow-up. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 39(3), 184-189.

Meredith, B. & Underwood, J. (1995). Irreconcilable differences? defining the rising conflict between regular and special education. Journal of Law and Education, 24(2), 195-226.

Miller, G.L. (2000). Job Satisfaction Among Teachers in Member Schools of the Southeast Region of the Association of Christian Schools International. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville). Dissertation Abstracts International, 61(6).

Miller, M.D., Brownell, M.T., & Smith, S.W. (1999). Factors that predict teachers staying in, leaving, or transferring from the special education classroom. Exceptional Children, 65, 201-218.

Mortimer, J.T. (1979). Changing Attitudes Toward Work. Scarsdale, N.Y.: Work In America Institute.

Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Orientation toward the job and organization. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1997). Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Newby, J.E. (1999). Job Satisfaction of Middle School Principals in Virginia. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1999). ETD No. 031899-164059.

O'Driscoll, M.P. & Randall, D.M. (1999). Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards, and employee job involvement, and organizational commitment. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48(2), 197-209.

Pearson, C.A. (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction of a self-managed system for monitoring group schievement. Human Relations, 44(5), 517-537.

Phillips, L., Sapona, R.H., & Lubic, B.L. (1995). Developing partnerships in inclusive education: one school's approach. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 262-272.

Porter, L.W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45, 1-10.

Quarstein, V.A., McAfee, R.B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. Human Relations, 45(8), 859-873.

Rain, J.S., Lane, I.M., & Steiner, D.D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: review and future considerations. Human Relations, 44(3), 287-307.

Rhodes, S.R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: a review and conceptual analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 93(2), 328-367.

Rhodes-Offutt, E.A. (1990). Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Among Early Childhood Educators. (Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International 51(07), 2262A.

Robie, C., Ryan, A.M., Schmieder, R.A., Parra, L.F., & Smith, P.C. (1998). The relationship between job level and job satisfaction. Group and Organizational Management, 23(4), 470-495.

Ronen, S. (1978). Job satisfaction and the neglected variable of job security. Human Relations, 31(4), 297-308.

Rosenberg, M.S., Griffin, C.G., Kilgore, K.L., & Carpenter, S.L. (1997). Beginning teachers in special education: a model for providing individualized support. Teacher Education and Special Education, 20, 301-321.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: implications for teacher induction programs. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 469-487.

Saleh, S.D., & Otis, J.L. (1964). Age and level of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 36, 425-430.

Scarpello, V. & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: are all the parts there? Personnel Psychology, 36, 577-600.

Schroffel, A. (1999). How does clinical supervision affect job satisfaction? The Clinical Supervisor, 18(2), 91-105.

Schuh, A.J. (1967). The predictability of employee tenure: a review of the literature. Personnel Psychology, 20, 133-152.

Sharpe, M.N., York, J.L., & Knight, J. (1994). Effects of inclusion on the academic performance of classmates without disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 14, 281-287.

Shoho, A.R., & Katims, D.S. (1998). Perceptions of Alienation Among Special and General Education Teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego, CA.

Singer, J.D. (1993). Once is not enough: former special educators who return to teaching. Exceptional Children, 60, 58-72.

Smith-Davis, G., & Billingsley, B. (1993). The supply/demand puzzle. Teacher Education and Special Education, 16, 202-217.

Snow, J. (1991). Dreaming, speaking, and creating: what I know about creativity. Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 19, 12-27.

Spector, P.E. (1997). Job Satisfaction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Staub, D. & Peck, C. (1995). What are the outcomes for non-disabled students? Educational Leadership, 52, 36-40.

Steel, R.P., & Rentsch, J.R. (1997). The dispositional model of job attitudes revisited: findings of a 10-year study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(6), 873-879.

Sutton, G.W., & Huberty, T.J. (1984). An evaluation of teacher stress and job satisfaction. Education, 105, 189-192.

Sweeney, J. (1981). Professional discretion and teacher satisfaction. The High School Journal, 65(1), 1-6.

Taylor, F.W. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper Brothers.

Thorpe, R.P., & Campbell, D.P. (1965). Expressed interests and worker satisfaction. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44, 238-243.

Thorsen-Spano, L. (1996). A school conflict resolution program: relationships among teacher attitude, program implementation, and job satisfaction. School Counselor, 44(1), 19-28.

Valentine, S., Valentine, W.R., & Dick, J. (1998). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivators and older employees' attitudes towards their current jobs. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 87, 407-410.

Vivian, T.P. (1983). The Relationship Between Perceived Leadership Styles, Size of School, and Non-Instructional Time on Teacher Job Satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1983.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V.H., & Deci, E.L. (eds.) (1970). Management and Motivation. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.

Walker, B.E. (2001). A Study of Job Satisfaction in the Tennessee Association of Christian Schools. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 2001). Dissertation Abstracts International, 62(04).

Walker, M.D. (1996). A Comparison of Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction Between Teachers in Magnet High Schools and Teacher in Non-magnet High Schools in

the Indianapolis Public Schools. (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57(04), 1434A.

Wanous, J.P., & Lawler, E.E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(2), 95-105.

Weiskopf, P.E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 47(1), 18-23.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: xxii. Minneapolis, MN: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.

Wolery, M., Werts, M.G., Caldwell, N.K., Snyder, E.D., & Liskowski, L. (1995). Experienced teachers' perceptions of resources and supports for inclusion. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 30(1), 1-26.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Description of Project WINning Team

Project WINning Team
Program Overview As Presented to Participating Schools

Project Goals:

To develop a collaborative educational program at the K-5 level that when implemented effectively reduces pupil - teacher ratio, improves individual student performance and attendance, reduces retention and referrals to special education, reduces the number of students eligible for categorical programs, and complies with the mandates of IDEA regarding access to the general curriculum and least restrictive environment.

To develop and implement a comprehensive professional development program that provides:
a) certification for general education teachers in interrelated special education, and
b) in-service training for teachers who work in schools that have collaborative education as a goal.

I. Project Description

- All students identified as eligible for services through categorical programs (SIA, REP, Title I, Special Education) and served in the general classroom will be supported by one special education support teacher who teams with the general classroom teacher. The exceptions are those students with low incidence disabilities (i.e. hearing impaired. visually impaired. moderate/severe/profound intellectual disabilities, orthopedically impaired) who are served in the general classroom. These students will be served by additional appropriately certified teachers and paraprofessionals.

- The amount of time the support teacher teams with the general classroom teacher will be minimally determined by the Individual Education Program (IEP) of the classroom student who receives special education services for the highest number of segments. For example, if both student A and student B are in the same classroom and student A's IEP requires two segments of Special Education daily and student B's IEP requires one segment daily, the classroom is supported for two segments.

- A provision will be made at each school whereby any special education student for whom modifications and adaptations provided within the general classroom have proven ineffective or who is dangerous or disruptive can be served in a self-contained or resource Special Education model.

- Special Education teachers will serve as "Case Managers" for students with disabilities and will be responsible for the Individual Education Program and due

process of these students until such time as other support teachers are appropriately trained.

- Appropriate probationary certification will be obtained in order that support teachers can deliver instruction to special education students.

II. Project Training

- An Agreement will be entered into with Kennesaw State University the first year of the project and with colleges and universities in south and middle Georgia in years two and three, respectively, to offer classes necessary for add-on Interrelated Special Education certification. Cohort groups composed of support teachers will complete all requirements for certification within a three-year time frame. Classes will be offered during the school day. Teachers will be released to attend classes one day per week. Substitutes will be provided. Classes will begin fall 2000.

- Teachers may elect to continue in the program after certification requirements are met and obtain a M.Ed. Additional courses beyond those required for certification will be at the teacher's expense and during his or her own time.

- Site-based and regional staff development classes focusing on teaming and collaboration will be offered. Fifty contact hours or five SDUs will be required for all team teachers and administrators not involved in the cohort group. Classes will be offered summer 2000. Stipends will be paid to participants.

- Site-based and regional staff development classes focusing on teaming and collaboration will be offered for all paraprofessionals participating in the project. Twenty hours of training will be required and can be used toward initial licensure renewal. Classes will be offered during generally scheduled staff development days during the 2000-2001 school year.

- Consultants will facilitate the project throughout its implementation. These consultants will provide training as necessary in collaboration, instructional strategies, curriculum modifications and adaptations, characteristics of exceptional students, behavior management, flexible grouping, multiple intelligence's, learning styles, and other topics as requested. Training will be consistent across schools with the same training modules being used. Consultants will also provide recommendations regarding scheduling, appropriate and effective use of staff, and classroom management.

- The project will emphasize whole school reform rather than restructuring categorical programs and services.

- This project will create a statewide network of community partners and other projects that provide training and technical assistance to schools engaged in similar activities.

- Parents at each school will be provided an information workshop on the project and additional workshops on specific components of the project. Parents will also be invited to participate in any staff development training provided to school staff.

- The project will facilitate site-based decision making by all key stakeholders to include parents, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals. therapists, peers, private providers, and consultants.

III. Project Guidelines

- System superintendent, categorical program directors, school principal and staff, and parents must support project implementation and sign a letter of agreement to receive project funds.

- Project cohort teachers must agree to complete add-on Interrelated Special Education certification requirements.

- All staff not involved in the project cohort group must agree to complete staff development training focusing on collaboration and teaming.

- Principals must agree not to transfer project cohort teachers to general classrooms during the three years of the project's duration unless they are replaced by certified special education teachers.

- Student selection for the project will be based on the decision of the IEP committee.

- Schools and systems must agree to work with key stakeholders, including parents, to develop an action plan that includes, as a minimum, effective implementation of staffing and scheduling patterns.

- Schools must group students heterogeneously. In as much as possible, a "natural distribution" of students receiving special education should be maintained in the general classroom.

- Schools must agree to implement appropriate instructional practices that facilitate teaming and collaboration.

IV. Project School Selection Criteria

In order to assure the success of project implementation within the timelines indicated, it is imperative that the first ten elementary schools in the new cohort (00-03) be very carefully chosen based on the following criteria:

- First and foremost, to be chosen the school must have administrators, staff, and parents that are supportive of the project's implementation and are willing to follow the guidelines.

- Logistics of the school must be considered in that teachers must be within traveling distance of the training location and enough teachers must be gathered within an area to form a cohort group. In addition, a college or university within the area must be willing to provide the training. For this reason, project implementation should be by region with North Georgia the first year, South Georgia the second year, and Middle Georgia the third year. Careful attention will be given to assure inclusion of minorities.

- Once a school has been tentatively selected based on initial contact with the appropriate administrator, a representative(s) from GADOE will meet with the principal and administrators of categorical programs; elementary curriculum director; and, where appropriate, the superintendent. The GADOE representative will provide a detailed presentation of the project and the action planning process at this time.

- Once support is obtained from all interested stakeholders, final selection will be made.

- Schools currently served by Project WINS will continue to work under their existing (98-01) contracts and action plans.

V. Project Evaluation and Dissemination Component

- Standardized assessment instruments will be used. Scores will reflect spring to spring testing. Previous year's scores will be compared for students in reading and math.

- Kindergarten will use GKAP-R as assessment component.

- Progress of students receiving special education will be monitored through the IEP in addition to standardized or alternative assessment as indicated in the IEP.

- Data will also be taken on number of student retentions; student attendance; number of students receiving special education served in the general classroom; and pupil-teacher ratio.

*Additional assessment beyond what is currently required for these programs is not anticipated.

- Results of project evaluation will be disseminated to schools in the form of reports and presentations.

- Project will maintain a website at Kennesaw State University to disseminate success stories to parents and other interested parties.

VI. Project Projected Cost for First Year Implementation Based on Ten Elementary Schools in Ten Different School Systems and Continuation of Current Project WINS Sites

Certification Training

• Tuition cost for 30 cohort teachers	$54,000
• Substitutes for cohort teachers to attend training	$24,000
• Books for cohort teachers	$9,000
Total Certification Training Cost	$87,000

Staff Development Training

• Substitute teachers	$3,000
• Conference attendance	$10,000
• Consultants	105,500
• Materials development	$25,000
• Stipends	$30,000
• Travel	$12,000
Total Staff Development Training Cost	**$213,500**

Personnel

• Salary and benefits for ten teachers	$350,000
• Salary and benefits for ten paraprofessionals	$180,000
• Salary and benefits for one secretary	$30,000
• Salary and benefits for one project coordinator	$52,000
• Salary and benefits for one technical assistant	$52,000
• Salary and benefits for one technical assistant for Georgia Learning Connection	$60.000
• Release time for Kennesaw State University faculty for project oversight evaluation and technical assistance	$42,000
Total Personnel Cost	**$766,000**

Operating Cost

Travel	$12,000
University indirect cost	$20,000
Total Operating Cost	**$32,000**
Total Project Cost	**$1,098,500**

VII. Project Timelines

March 2000	Project publicized within individual system and schools to staff, parents and administrators.
April 2000	Individual school plans developed. SDU courses developed.
April 2000	Finalize plans with colleges/universities. Finalize SDU courses.
May 2000	Select teachers for project cohort group, hiring of additional special education teachers and paraprofessionals.
June 2000	Development of paraprofessional training classes.
July 2000	SDU course for participating team teachers. Probationary certificate obtained for project cohort teachers. Register project cohort teachers for classes.

VIII Project Expansion Timelines

FY 2000	Preparation Year
FY 2001	First year implementations for 10 elementary schools – college/university selected for second 10 schools and mentored by Kennesaw State University.
FY 2002	Second year implementations for 10 schools, add 10 additional schools – college/university selected for third 10 schools, and mentored by Kennesaw State University.
FY 2003	Third year implementation for 10 schools, second year implementation for 10 schools. Add 10 additional schools. First cohort group completes training.

APPENDIX B

Request to Use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

8 Wickley Rd.
Chattanooga, TN 37415

April 16, 2002

Vocational Psychology Research
N. 620 Elliot Hall
University of Minnesota
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a graduate student at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville working on my doctoral dissertation. My research study is to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and schools using inclusion as a means of special education service delivery and those who use more traditional methods. In order to determine the level of job satisfaction, I am requesting to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Appropriate credit will be given to your institution if permission to use the instrument is granted.

Your written permission will be truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard

APPENDIX C

Letters to Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENT

8 Wickley Rd.
Chattanooga, TN 37415

September 2002

John Doe
Superintendent
Smith County Schools
5555 Nebulous Drive
Anywhere, Georgia 20736

Dr. Doe:

I respectfully request permission to gather research data from a sample of general and special education teachers within your system. Participation will be voluntary and anonymity is ensured. No student data is required.

Three letters are attached for your consideration. First, the letter for potential participants will serve as a cover letter for the questionnaire. Secondly, the letter to the building principals will be sent to provide information and to ask for their assistance in facilitating the data collection. Also attached is a copy of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, which will be sent to the surveyed population. Finally, I have attached a response card that will serve as written documentation of your consent for my study.

Any recommendations you could give toward this study would be much appreciated. I look forward to receiving your response to my request.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard
Graduate Student
The University of Tennessee at Knoxville

PERMISSION TO SURVEY RESPONSE CARD (SYSTEM)

Permission is granted for Jonathan E. Willard to conduct a survey of job satisfaction perceptions among general and special education teachers at:

_____ in _____

(System) (City/State)

_____ _____

(Signature of Superintendent) (Date)

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Dear Administrator:

This letter is a follow-up to our recent telephone conversation regarding my collection of data for my doctoral dissertation. As I indicated earlier, your school has been randomly selected to take part in the study that examines perceptions of job satisfaction between general and special education teachers in schools using the inclusion model and those who do not. Permission was obtained from Dr. Doe to gather research data from some of the general and special education teachers within your school.

The study will consist of a twenty-question survey (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form) and a one-page personal information survey. Participation by faculty members from within your school will be voluntary, and anonymity is ensured. Results will be analyzed as a whole to further ensure the anonymity of the responses.

I am requesting that either you or your designee distribute the surveys upon their arrival. When completed, the teachers should seal their responses in the envelopes provided and return them to your office. A deadline for the return of the responses will be set for three weeks following the mail date. On the day following the deadline, which will be noted in the survey cover letter, I would appreciate your returning all completed surveys to me in the post-paid mailer, which will be provided.

The data gathered will be used only as indicated in my proposal and will not have any impact upon the individual schools surveyed. No identification of your school will be attached to responses received from your teachers.

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. Please understand that your decision to participate is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. It is my hope that the findings of the research will contribute to the body of knowledge relating to inclusion and it's impact upon general and special education teachers. If you would fill out the enclosed response card, it will serve as written documentation of your agreement to participate in the study.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard

PERMISSION TO SURVEY RESPONSE CARD (SCHOOL)

Permission is granted for Jonathan E. Willard to conduct a survey of job satisfaction perceptions among general and special education teachers at:

_____ in _____
(Name/School) (City/State)

Number of surveys needed (all teachers kindergarten and above): _____

_____ _____
(Signature of chief administrator) (Date)

ADMINISTRATOR COVER LETTER

Dear Administrator:

Enclosed you will find the materials for conducting the survey of your teachers regarding their perceptions of job satisfaction. Please distribute one envelope to each of your general and special education teachers in grades kindergarten and above. Each envelope contains the following:

- Letter explaining the purpose of the study
- Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
- Informed Consent Form

Each teacher who chooses to participate is to complete the questionnaire and the personal descriptors form and seal it in the envelope. The envelopes should be returned to you or your designee. The deadline for returning the surveys to your office is _____. Please send whatever surveys have been collected up to that date. A post-paid mailer has been provided for returning the surveys.

As mentioned in my previous letter, teacher and school participation is voluntary. There should be no pressure placed on the teachers to participate. If you or any of your teachers desire to withdraw from the study, that is certainly an option with no consequences whatsoever.

Thank you for your cooperation and sacrifice of time and effort on behalf of this study.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard

ADMINISTRATOR FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Administrator:

This is a reminder that I need to receive the job satisfaction surveys sent to your school in _____. The deadline date for returning the surveys is _____.

I would appreciate it if you would send out a general memo to all teachers reminding them of the survey and deadline date. Please remind them that their participation is voluntary, they will be anonymous, all data will be kept confidential, and there are no penalties for choosing not to participate.

Please return those surveys that have been completed in the post-paid mailer the day following the deadline _____.

Your school's participation is very important. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard

APPENDIX D

Teacher Cover Letter

TEACHER COVER LETTER

Dear Teacher:

I am a special education/inclusion teacher in the Catoosa County school system and am also pursuing a doctoral degree in education at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. I need your assistance in conducting a study of the perceptions of job satisfaction among elementary school teachers in schools using the inclusion model and those using more traditional methods (resource) of special education service delivery. I have selected the State of Georgia for my study due to my teaching position.

Both your superintendent and principal have granted permission to conduct this study. Your school has been randomly selected to take part and your participation is very important. All responses to the survey will be anonymous. All individual responses will be kept in the strictest confidence. Participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from participation at any time with no penalties or ramifications of any kind. For adequate data analysis, however, I need your participation.

I have enclosed an Informed Consent form giving more information about the study and protective measures for those who participate. Please take time to read it prior to completing the survey. If you are in agreement, take approximately ten minutes to respond the enclosed Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the personal information questions attached to it. For completion of the study and to assist in analyzing the data, it is essential that you complete that information and return it with the completed questionnaire. Please seal your questionnaire and descriptive questions page in the envelope provided and return it to your school office on or before _____. Your administrator will send me the surveys that have been completed by that date.

I appreciate your help in providing the information needed for this study.

Sincerely,

Jonathan E. Willard

APPENDIX E

Personal Descriptors Page

Confidential Background Information

Please answer all the following questions by placing an "X" in the appropriate box.

Gender:

☐ **Male** ☐ **Female**

Age Range:

☐ **20-29** ☐ **30-39** ☐ **40-49** ☐ **50-59** ☐ **60+**

Marital Status:

☐ **Single** ☐ **Married** ☐ **Widowed** ☐ **Divorced**

Highest Degree Earned:

☐ **Bachelors** ☐ **Masters** ☐ **Ed.S.** ☐ **Ed.D/Ph.D.**

Years of Teaching Experience:

☐ **1-3** ☐ **4-7** ☐ **8-15** ☐ **16+**

Current level of pay:

☐ **$20,000 - $29,999** ☐ **$30,000 - $39,999** ☐ **$40,000 - $49,999**
☐ **$49,999+**

How do you classify yourself with regard to your teaching position?

☐ **General Education Teacher** ☐ **Special Education Teacher**

Do you teach in a classroom in which special education students are taught with their non-disabled peers?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

Do you use a collaborative or co-teaching model when teaching students with disabilities?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

APPENDIX F

Informed Consent

Informed Consent for Subjects Receiving Survey

This informed consent is for individuals participating in the survey for the doctoral research conducted by Jonathan E. Willard of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. The title of this study is "Investigating the Job Satisfaction of General and Special Education Teachers in Selected Georgia Schools Implementing the Inclusion Model." The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction of general and special educators in schools implementing the inclusion model as compared to general and special educators in schools that use more traditional methods of special education service delivery, such as resource and pull-out models of instruction. The following protective measures will be provided for all participants:

1) The chief administrator at each school has been personally contacted to secure permission to conduct the survey and is aware that teacher and school participation in the study is voluntary.

2) Teacher participation in the study is strictly voluntary and will not impact the teacher's standing at the school. Teachers are under no pressure to respond and those who choose to participate may withdraw from the study at any time with no penalties for doing so.

3) Anonymity will be assured for all participants because the questionnaire contains no identifying questions or codes. Results will be totaled, arranged in table form, and analyzed as a whole.

4) Individual responses and personal descriptive information will not be identifiable and will be kept confidential.

5) Selection of schools to participate in the survey has been done through a random selection process.

6) Although the study will not benefit those who participate, it will contribute to increased knowledge about perceptions of job satisfactions of general and special education teachers in schools implementing the inclusion model as compared to those using a more traditional model.

7) The data gathered will not be used in any way except as indicated in this proposal. Aggregate findings of the study will be available upon request.

8) The researcher, Jonathan E. Willard, will answer questions related to the study. His address is:

9) Return of the questionnaire, including the confidential background information, will constitute your informed consent to participate.

APPENDIX G

Frequency Tables for MSQ Short Form Responses

Table G1: Frequency Table for MSQ Short Form Responses

Scale	Very Diss.	Diss.	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Sat.
Activity	2	6	24	155	185
Independence	4	19	74	174	101
Variety	3	12	12	179	166
Social Status	4	5	71	184	108
Supervision – HR	7	9	23	122	211
Supervision – Tech	5	11	11	118	227
Moral Values	3	9	22	161	177
Security	4	5	5	124	234
Social Service	2	3	5	141	221
Authority	2	7	178	132	53
Ability Util.	2	6	7	147	210
School Policy	9	38	48	186	91
Compensation	31	172	71	87	11
Advancement	6	36	88	191	51
Responsibility	3	21	18	201	129
Creativity	3	23	18	167	161
Working Cond.	4	19	16	166	167
Co-Workers	5	27	27	180	133
Recognition	7	28	40	184	113
Achievement	4	13	9	185	161

APPENDIX H

Modifications to the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form

Table H1: Modifications to Questions on the MSQ – Short Form

From:	To:
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.	5. The way my principal handles his/her faculty.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.	6. The competence of my principal in making decisions.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.	12. The way school policies are put into practice.

VITA

Jonathan Edward Willard was born in Chattanooga, Tennessee and attended Tennessee public schools. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga majoring in History and Psychology. Following graduation, he began his first teaching job with the Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation as a Psychiatric Teacher/Counselor at Pine Breeze Center, part of Moccasin Bend Mental Health Institute. After teaching at this facility for four years, Willard became employed as a special education/inclusion teacher at Loftis Middle School in Hixson, Tennessee. While in this position, he had the opportunity to coach cross country, track, and wrestling. In 2000, he became employed at Battlefield Elementary School in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia and worked in developing the inclusive education program, integrating students with disabilities into the general education classroom. In 2002, after teaching in the special education field for ten years, Willard entered the administrative ranks as assistant principal of Battlefield Elementary School. In 2004, he received his Doctorate in Education from the University of Tennessee. He currently lives in Chattanooga, Tennessee. He and his wife Jabrina have one daughter.